United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *114th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2015 *No. 19*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 4, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

OPENING OF THE FLORIDA CENTER FOR CYBERSECURITY AT UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important event taking place this Friday in the 15th Congressional District of Florida which I have the privilege to represent.

With the opening of the Florida Center for Cybersecurity on the campus of the University of South Florida, also known as USF, in Tampa this Friday, our State marshals the strength of all of Florida's public universities to respond to our Nation's cybersecurity workforce needs.

The center will help develop the next generation of technology to prevent cyber attacks and provide a resource for Florida businesses to help them prevent and, if necessary, respond to cyber threats.

I want to congratulate the board of governors for our State university system, our Florida State Legislature, and our Florida Governor for recognizing the critical importance of the growing cyber threat to Florida residents and businessowners throughout the world. These leaders are doing something about that threat by establishing the Florida Center for Cybersecurity.

They recognized that with our growing reliance on Internet connectivity each and every day, cybersecurity becomes increasingly more vital. Cybersecurity reaches every facet of modern life, from national security to personal communication, from data storage to banking security, from health care privacy to transportation safety.

In just 7 short months, the center has enrolled its first 100 students in a special cybersecurity master's degree program. Just last October, the program at USF became only the second in the Nation to be designated as a National Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance and Cybersecurity.

The center continues to address the serious shortfall in our Nation's cybersecurity workforce by bringing online degree, certificate, and training programs to facilitate industry-recognized specializations to enhance the cybersecurity workforce, mitigate cybersecurity threats, and attract new businesses to Florida and across our great Nation.

Most importantly, the university will reach out to our Nation's heroes who have proudly served in uniform and return to civilian life to allow them to continue to protect our homeland.

Tampa is the perfect home for this new cyber mission with its close proximity to the headquarters of the U.S. Central Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and the Joint Cyber Command at MacDill Air Force Base.

The Tampa Bay region is also a center for our State's financial and health care industries. National, State, and local businesses—large and small—will benefit from the continuing outreach and educational programs offered by the Florida Center for Cybersecurity at USF.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud USF's energy and innovation in responding to the national and international cyber threat. This is the type of quick and thorough response our Nation needs as we bring together the best our public and private sectors have to offer in protecting our citizens and our businesses from this ongoing threat to our national security, our personal security, and economic security.

Congratulations to USF, and go, Bulls.

AWARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the areas where Congress has repeatedly come together in a nonpartisan fashion to make real progress has been legislation dealing with the protection of animals. This is something that unites us as we have been able to deal with a series of simple, commonsense steps to assure we meet the standard of care.

That is why it was so horrific to read the terrible front-page article in The New York Times on January 20 about the Federal Meat Animal Research Center in Clay Center, Nebraska. Moving from the front page to two full

Printed on recycled paper.

pages on the inside were truly grotesque and horrifying examples of animal abuse.

A young cow had its head locked in a cagelike device to keep her immobile while she was repeatedly—you can only describe it as sexually tortured for hours by as many as six bulls being studied for their sexual libido. Her back legs were broken, her body—in the words of one of the observers—was ''torn up,'' and the cow understandably died from her injuries.

There were other experiments detailed, sheep and pigs, without consideration of animal health impact. It detailed horrifying and often unsuccessful results. At least 6,500 animals were known to have starved to death at this facility, and unknown numbers died from negligence from easily treatable infections, exposure to bad weather, or attacks by predators—all of this at a cost of almost $200 million of taxpayer money over the last 10 years, resulting in this grotesque abuse of animals.

There is the ability to abuse, neglect, and even torture farm animals because there is no law that requires their protection. There is a loophole in the Animal Welfare Act which exempts farm animals used for research.

Think about it. If you are abusing, neglecting, or even torturing farm animals for agricultural research, you don't have to obey the Animal Welfare Act. It is absolutely unjustified and outrageous.

This week, Congressman MICHAEL FITZPATRICK—my cochair of the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus—and I are introducing the AWARE Act which would require that in Federal facilities, farm animals used in agricultural research be included in the definition of ''animal'' under the Animal Welfare Act.

It seems rather simple. It would ensure that these animals are treated like other warmblooded animals in other Federal research facilities. It is time that we step up to stop this horrific abuse. There is no reason that the USDA agricultural research facilities experimenting on farm animals should not be held to the same standards as Federal research facilities that conduct lifesaving disease research with the same kinds of animals.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this AWARE Act, the Animal Welfare and Agricultural Research Endeavors. It is supported by The Humane Society, the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Humane Legislative Fund, and countless people across the country who deeply believe in animal welfare.

This is our job in Congress, and this is a small step that we can quickly make to show that we respond to animal abuse and that the Federal Government will lead by example.

I would urge my colleagues to join Congressman FITZPATRICK and me as members of the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus to work together on behalf of God's creatures who cannot speak for themselves.

PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD ADMISSION PROCESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the most forceful and ambitious statehood admission bill for Puerto Rico in U.S. history. The bill, fittingly, has 51 original cosponsors from both parties.

Before I describe the bill, let me explain its background. In 2012, the Puerto Rico government sponsored a referendum in which voters rejected Puerto Rico's current territory status and expressed a clear preference for statehood.

In the 113th Congress, at my initiative, the President proposed and Congress approved an appropriation of $2.5 million to fund the first federally sponsored status vote in Puerto Rico's history. The funding will remain available until it is used by the Puerto Rico government.

While the law does not prescribe the exact format of the ballot, it does establish important conditions; namely, the law provides that the U.S. Department of Justice must certify that the ballot and voter education materials are consistent with U.S. law and policy.

The bipartisan bill I am introducing today flows from and builds upon the 2012 referendum and the Federal appropriation enacted in response to that referendum. In other words, this bill is being filed now because the strategic foundation is firmly in place.

Every action I take is designed to advance the statehood cause because it is beyond dispute that territory status is the main source of Puerto Rico's grave economic and social problems. My constituents have no interest in symbolic gestures or empty rhetoric. They care only about concrete steps that bring Puerto Rico closer to equality.

My bill would authorize a vote to be held in Puerto Rico within 1 year of the bill's enactment—that is, by no later than the end of 2017. The ballot would contain a single question: Shall Puerto Rico be admitted as a State of the United States?

To conduct this vote, the Puerto Rico government may use the $2.5 million that Congress already approved since this format clearly satisfies the conditions of the appropriations law. If a majority of voters affirm their desire for admission, the bill provides for an automatic series of steps to occur.

First, by February 2018, the President would issue a proclamation to begin Puerto Rico's transition to statehood.

Second, the President would appoint a commission to prepare a report that describes the Federal laws that treat the territory of Puerto Rico differently than the States. The commission would complete the report by July 2018. The congressional committees of jurisdiction could then enact legislation to phase in equal treatment of Puerto Rico during the transition period so the admission process is structured and orderly.

Third, in November 2020, the American citizens of Puerto Rico would vote for President and Vice President, two U.S. Senators, and voting Members of the U.S. House.

Finally, on January 1, 2021, the President would proclaim Puerto Rico to be a State. Puerto Rico's congressional Representatives would be sworn into office, and Puerto Rico would be treated on equal footing with all other States.

My bill is modeled on the legislation enacted by Congress with respect to Alaska and Hawaii. When Alaska and Hawaii were territories, they each held votes sponsored by their local governments in which voters expressed a desire for statehood. This is also what occurred in Puerto Rico in 2012.

Ultimately, Congress enacted an admission act for Alaska in 1958 and an admission act for Hawaii in 1959. Those acts of Congress provided for admission to occur once a majority of voters in each territory affirmed in a federally sponsored vote that they desired statehood. That is precisely what my bill would do with respect to Puerto Rico.

Every Member of Congress who cosponsors this bill is standing up for a powerful, powerful principle, which is this: the people of Puerto Rico are U.S. citizens, they have enriched the life of this Nation for generations, and they have fought and died to defend her.

If a majority of Puerto Rico's voters affirm their desire in a federally sponsored vote to become a full and equal part of the American family, the will of the people should be honored. Democracy requires no less.

SERVICEMEMBER ASSISTANCE FOR LAWFUL UNDERSTANDING, TREATMENT, AND EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, my fellow Chester County Congressman, PATRICK MEEHAN, introduced the Servicemember Assistance for Lawful Understanding, Treatment, and Education Act, otherwise known as the SALUTE Act.

I want to praise Congressman MEEHAN for his leadership on this issue and speak a little bit about it in support of the SALUTE Act.

□ 1015

It is going to help veterans overcome addictions and PTSD by providing yearly Federal funding for Veterans Treatment Courts. This is an opportunity for all of us to help troubled veterans break free of the cycle and get the help that they need.

It is estimated that one in five veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq will experience a stress-related

mental illness. Veterans Treatment Courts assist soldiers who are charged with nonviolent crimes and who are struggling with certain addictions or mental illnesses. Veterans Treatment Courts provide an opportunity for them to get their lives back on the right track and to not spiral down a track of addiction.

Pennsylvania, as you may know, is a hub of veterans courts, as 18 counties have them. In fact, three counties that I represent—Chester, Montgomery, and Berks—have Veterans Treatment Courts, and I have seen firsthand as the Chester County commissioner how impactful and effective they can be. I have witnessed firsthand how important it is to the lives of returning veterans. So I share with you a quote that I received from Chester County District Attorney Tom Hogan:

> These brave men and women have sacrificed so much to serve our country and protect our freedom. We owe it to them to help them when they return home. Veterans court provides the structure and support to address the unique needs of combat veterans who find themselves in the criminal justice system. It is our duty to thank our veterans by offering help as they readjust to civilian life.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the SALUTE Act, and I want to thank, again, Congressman MEEHAN for introducing it. When the time comes, I encourage my colleagues to fullheartedly support the SALUTE Act. It is commonsense legislation that will help our Nation's heroes.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of President Obama's fiscal year 2016 budget.

It is a budget that is firmly rooted in middle class economics, designed to benefit working families and middle-income Americans. It is a budget that will facilitate access to quality, affordable child care and will dramatically expand prekindergarten education in a way that will allow the children of middle class Americans to get off to a faster start in life.

President Obama's budget, with the full support of House Democrats, will also address wage stagnation. It is designed to put more income—more money—in the pockets of middle class Americans and of those who aspire to be part of the middle class. It will address the fact that, since the early 1970s, the productivity of the American worker has increased consistently, yet middle class wages have remained stagnant. That is a systematic problem that President Obama, Leader PELOSI, and House Democrats are determined to address on behalf of the middle class.

President Obama's budget is also designed to increase the affordability of a college education. We know that Americans right now are burdened with more than $1 trillion in student loan debt. That type of debt limits the ability of younger Americans to purchase a home, to start a family, to open up a new business, to take a chance. It limits their ability to robustly access the American Dream. President Obama's budget is designed to allow the sons and daughters of the middle class to pursue their dreams in a more meaningful fashion.

When President Obama took office, he inherited an economic train wreck as a result of the Great Recession that was handed to him by the policies of the previous Republican administration. Through the leadership of President Obama, working closely with Democrats in the House and the Senate, we have turned the economy around. We have gotten it back on the right track.

So the question that we in this Congress face today is: Will we continue the policies of middle class economics, which are designed to benefit working families and moderate income Americans, or are we going to regress to the policies of trickle-down economics, which have failed middle class Americans time and time again?

I am in my second term. When I first got to the Congress, I assumed that trickle-down economics was dead, doomed by the fact that it has failed over and over again. Apparently, it has been revived.

In its most recent incarnation, House Republicans would like to drop the top tax rate from 39.6 percent on the wealthiest Americans all the way down to 25 percent. Their argument is: ''Don't worry, everybody is going to benefit.'' But that hasn't worked in the past. In fact, I am convinced that middle class economics is far more preferable to trickle-down economics, which, as it relates to the middle class, simply means you may be lucky to get a trickle, but you are guaranteed to stay down. That is what the record says.

Bill Clinton inherited a recession. The top tax rate on high-income earners was 31 percent. He raised it to 39.6 percent, and the purveyors of trickle-down economics predicted economic doom and gloom. What happened when President Clinton focused on the middle class? More than 20 million jobs were created. He then handed over a budget surplus to President Bush and his coconspirators in the Congress, and like drunken sailors, they blew that budget surplus on failed wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and on a tax cut that disproportionately benefited the wealthy and the well off. Did trickle-down economics work when they dropped the top tax rate to 35 percent? No. During the Bush Presidency, 650,000-plus jobs were lost.

President Obama inherited this economic mess, and in partnership with Democrats in the House and in the Senate, he renewed his focus on the middle class. He even raised the top tax rate back up to 39.6 percent. Doom and gloom was predicted, but what happened? The economy is humming. The stock market is way up. Gas prices are way down. The unemployment rate has come down. Economic growth is exceeding all of the competitors across the world.

There is more to be done, but for us to be successful, we have got to abandon the focus on the wealthy and the well off and pursue middle class economics.

JOHN TEDORE, A HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a native Iowan—John Tedore from West Des Moines—for his service to our great country.

Mr. Tedore was a member of the elite First Special Service Force that became renowned for their missions in Italy and southern France in World War II.

Mr. Tedore was in Washington, D.C., yesterday—in the great Capitol Building here—along with nearly 40 of his fellow veterans, known as the Devil's Brigade, to receive the prestigious Congressional Gold Medal, which is the highest honor Congress can bestow upon civilians. For the men of the Devil's Brigade, this is an honor highly deserved. John Tedore—this hero, this Iowan—stood for all of those who could not be here so that they may never be forgotten for their selfless and heroic service.

We must never forget those who answered the call to serve to protect our rights and our liberties and to make this a safer world for this Nation and the cause of freedom.

To John Tedore and your fellow members of the Devil's Brigade, from a grateful nation and from this grateful Iowan, congratulations on this highest of honors, and God bless you.

THE NEXT AMERICAN CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly about two aspects of the President's budget that really struck me and a number of my constituents in Philadelphia and Montgomery County as so important.

As a new Member, it has been a special honor to be serving in this Chamber, and I have had a few incredibly special moments that all Americans can identify with. One is the swearing-in of a new Congress, something that dates back to right after our First Congress was sworn in right after the U.S. Constitution was signed in Philadelphia. One of those other moments—a constitutionally mandated moment—is

when the President comes to Congress to give a report on the state of the Union from time to time, as the Constitution says.

Sitting right here in this Chamber and hearing President Obama speak about the state of our Union would be exciting in any year, in any circumstance, but it was especially this year because, for the first time in 6 years—after the deepest and darkest recession in almost a century—we have turned the page. After 6 rather difficult years of digging our way out of a ditch, we now can build a foundation to move forward. With that, there were two areas specifically that the President focused on.

One was a universal college education. As the first of my family to go to college, I know I wouldn't have had the opportunities that I have had in life without having a higher education. I needed a combination of scholarships and student loans and every sort of work-study job imaginable to get there, as well as help from parents and even grandparents. That is a story similar to so many working and middle class Americans, but for too many Americans today the cost of a higher education is simply unaffordable.

The question is: Do you go without it at all even though two-thirds of the jobs by the end of this decade will require some form of a higher education? Do you just forgo a higher education altogether, or do you take on tens of thousands in student loans and then be burdened with paying back that debt upon graduation? Either scenario is far from ideal.

What the President said—and I completely agree—is let's make 2 years of community college universal and free in this country. Now, that may be unthinkable today. 100 years ago, it was unthinkable that a free, fully funded high school education would be universal. Yet, for us, that is the reality today. It would be unthinkable for Americans of my age and even of an older age to imagine a time in which high school was not universal. Let's get there with 2 years of a college education.

The second area the President focused on was the child care tax credit. For so many working families and young families, affording child care is simply unaffordable. We have an opportunity through this budget to change that, to build on the successes of the last 6 years and to finally prepare to make this century the second American Century. Ensuring that we have good, high-quality, affordable child care is vital to this middle class.

The reason the last century was the American Century was that we had the largest and most productive middle class in the world. Access to higher education and access to child care are two necessary ingredients in making sure we have a strong and vibrant middle class in the 21st century.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dean Curry, Life Center Church, Tacoma, Washington, offered the following prayer:

Father, what an honor it is to be in Your presence here today. We celebrate this morning what You have done through the United States of America.

We acknowledge the hand of providence in our history and the force of inspiration for our future.

Be with us here now most significantly in our present that we could see what others do not see, that we could do what others fear to do, so that we could change what others are afraid to change.

We are reminded that we are so small and You are so big. Our problems are daunting, and our responsibilities are many. But we look to You today, to Your principles and to Your goodness, that we could be everything You designed for us to be, that we could do everything You planned for us to do, that others may be free.

Today, may every decision made, every plan contemplated, be sprinkled with Your grace and be inspired from Heaven. Change us; change our minds and our hearts that we may change our destiny and the destiny of others both here and around the world.

I pray all of this with respect to all faiths in the name of Jesus of Nazareth.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WALORSKI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DEAN CURRY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor today's guest chaplain, Reverend Dean Curry, from Tacoma, Washington.

We are blessed to have such a remarkable pastor with us today who is a leading figure in the region that I represent. Reverend Curry's Life Center Church in Tacoma is a vibrant place where folks young and old come for worship.

He knows what it means to give back to your community. Each month, he brings together civic and elected leaders in Tacoma for a faith breakfast, and volunteers from his church are always helping out those going through hard times.

The motto of his church sums up his work pretty remarkably: ''It's all about the people.'' That is why it is fitting to have Reverend Curry here today. Like the United States House of Representatives, his mission is to serve the people.

Reverend Curry is an example of how we should do more to listen, respect, and understand one another better so we can leave a place for future generations where opportunities are available for everyone.

Reverend Curry has also led humanitarian missions to troubled regions like Iraq and Afghanistan to offer assistance and hope to those suffering through tragedies. He is someone who ''walks the walk'' when it comes to fighting for equality, religious freedom, and social justice both in his community and around the world.

Whether he is listening to stories in refugee settlements or helping out with a national prayer breakfast, his passion for others shines through, and it is an honor to welcome him today.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 4, 2015 at 9:22 a.m.:

Appointment:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki).

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING THE SAFE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION 60TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to SAFE Federal Credit Union which on January 14 celebrated the 60th anniversary of its Federal charter.

In January 1955, 15 civilian employees at Shaw Air Force Base organized the SAFE Federal Credit Union. Throughout the years, SAFE's membership has expanded to nearly 500 additional groups and eight underserved communities. SAFE, headquartered in Sumter, South Carolina, is now the largest credit union serving the South Carolina Midlands with 108,000 members and $903 million in assets.

I am grateful for the work of SAFE's employees who have developed a reputation of exemplary service, knowledge, and trust under the leadership of SAFE's CEO and president, Beverly Gagne. They have also been on the cutting edge of fraud prevention which is critical as we address new cyber cases of crime.

With their professionalism in lending practices, members have created many opportunities and prompted thousands of new jobs. I know firsthand as a real estate attorney closing loans for SAFE.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our prayers for the people of Jordan as the latest victims of terrorism.

INVESTING IN OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, infrastructure investment is key to growing our economy and creating jobs which is why President Obama committed to a 40 percent increase in infrastructure funding in his budget released this week.

Despite the fact that every billion dollars invested in infrastructure creates 30,000 jobs, over the past 50 years, our investment in infrastructure has shrunk by half. Meanwhile, China is investing four times as much as we do in transportation.

We need these investments in Chicago where we have got a century-old transit system that needs updates to keep up with increased capacity. By the way, the Chicago Transit Authority carries more people in a month than Amtrak does in a year. We also need 1,000 miles of roads to be repaired, and 675 bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Our crumbling infrastructure is slowing economic growth, and without serious long-term investments, we simply will not be able to compete in today's global economy.

The President outlined his 21st century infrastructure plan this week. Now, it is time for Democrats and Republicans in Congress to work together on the long-term transportation bill the American people are asking for.

MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA BENEFICIARY TRAVEL ACT

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today after listening to the stories of veterans and their families. It is very apparent the VA is not doing enough to help victims overcome the physical and psychological pain of military sexual trauma.

This week, I introduced H.R. 642, a bill that would make victims of military sexual trauma eligible for VA travel benefits. Those who fight for our freedom have faced enough challenges along the way. Expecting them to pay for their own travel to receive care or treatment for the sexual trauma they endured by serving our country is unfair.

I am grateful today to work with Representative KUSTER, Representative COFFMAN, and Representative RUIZ on this important legislation, and I am hopeful it is a step in the right direction by helping veterans access much-needed care.

I encourage support for H.R. 642.

GO RED FOR WOMEN CAMPAIGN

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Go Red for Women.

More than 600,000 women's lives have been saved from heart disease since Go Red for Women was created in 2004, but heart disease still remains the number one killer for women and men and causes more deaths than all forms of cancer.

As a National Heart Association Board member, one of Columbus, Ohio's first Go Red chairs, and a member of the Congressional Heart Caucus, I rise today to recognize survivors, those battling with heart disease, and those who are fighting and working to find cures and improve treatments.

Today, Members of Congress will stand together, Democrats and Republicans, in red to send a message to the Nation that as colleagues, we can stand and celebrate the American Heart Association and its Go Red for Women campaign.

Mr. Speaker, working together, we will make a difference.

RECOGNIZING BILLY KIRKBRIDE

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to recognize a true American hero, Utah veteran Billy Kirkbride, who was just awarded the Congressional Gold Medal.

Billy joined the Army in 1942, and he was chosen to be part of the unique program called the First Special Service Force which was the forerunner of today's Special Forces. It was here that he became a member of the very elite Devil's Brigade.

The Congressional Gold Medal is awarded to those who have performed amazing feats leaving permanent impacts upon American culture and history. As a former Air Force pilot, I know the sacrifice and the dedication that it takes to become one of America's elite warriors.

It is an honor to stand here today not just before the American people, but before his lovely wife and daughters to pay tribute to the sacrifice and dedication that Billy showed through his service to this great Nation.

He doesn't just represent the strength of the Armed Forces, he represents American values that continue to make our Nation great, and millions of us are grateful for his service.

PASS A VETERANS JOBS BILL

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise on behalf of the many Illinois veterans that I represent and their families to draw attention to the high rate of veteran unemployment in America. After fighting for our Nation, far too many military heroes are being forced to fight for a job here at home.

Despite many veterans having the leadership skills and work ethic that businesses are looking for, the unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans is 6.9 percent, far higher than the national average of 5.6 percent.

I am committed to reducing veteran unemployment and helping our heroes find quality work. Last week, I released an updated edition of my veterans resource guidebook to help our veterans get the benefits they have earned and employment resources to get them and their families back in the workforce, but we need to do more.

I urge my colleagues to work with me to pass a veterans job bill to put the half million unemployed veterans back to work.

BENEFICIARY TRAVEL FOR VETERANS SEEKING TREATMENT OR CARE FOR MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleagues as we address one of the challenges within Veterans Affairs—our goal: ensuring our veterans are provided the best possible care to heal from the wounds associated with being a victim of military sexual trauma.

As has been noted by the Veterans Affairs inspector general, obtaining travel authorization to the most appropriate clinics to address the specialized care required of military sexual trauma victims has been an obstacle. This bill, H.R. 642, will take care of that.

The bottom line is that victims of military sexual assault trauma should be able to obtain the specific care necessary to address their individual needs and not be trapped by a bureaucracy that fails to give them access to treatment because it cannot reconcile how to pay for travel to get to and from a treatment facility.

Please join me and my colleagues as we stand up for veterans who are victims of military sexual trauma and enable them to obtain the treatment that they need.

□ 1215

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 lays out a fiscally responsible plan to invest in our future and makes sure that hardworking Americans are able to benefit from an economy that is finally improving. I am particularly pleased that the President is committed to making strategic investments in our Nation's research and development.

The budget invests $146 billion for R&D across the Federal Government, which is a 6 percent increase. The budget provides for $7 billion in clean energy funding throughout the Federal Government and $2.4 billion to further advance manufacturing technologies. This funding improves our scientific knowledge, creates technologies with widespread benefits, and strengthens U.S.-global competitiveness.

The budget also makes investments in public health, including $31 billion for the National Institutes of Health, which is a $1 billion increase over the 2015 level, and $1.2 billion across several agencies to combat antibiotic resistant bacteria, for advanced precision medicine, and for targeted therapies for patients.

I mention all of these, Mr. Speaker, because I do believe—and every evidence shows—that research investment creates jobs, promotes innovation, and increases economic development. That means more jobs. I hope that the Republicans will support the President's budget.

HAROLD EATMAN

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Harold Eatman of Matthews, North Carolina, who is a 99-year-young brave patriot who volunteered for the 82nd Airborne at the start of World War II because he wanted a tough assignment.

Mr. Eatman is one of the few paratroopers to make all four World War II jumps—into Sicily, Italy, Holland, and Normandy. For his bravery in helping to liberate France from Nazi brutality, the French Government on Tuesday awarded Mr. Eatman the prestigious Legion of Honor medal, an award created by Napoleon.

Mr. Eatman's dedication extends beyond the battlefield. Following his discharge after World War II, he volunteered for another year's Active Duty to help escort the bodies of fallen soldiers as they were returned home.

Please join me in thanking Harold Eatman for his bravery and sacrifice in fighting for freedom—an exemplary example of the Greatest Generation.

MS. WALTER BARBOUR, A TRUE TRAILBLAZER

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a true trailblazer, Ms. Walter Barbour—the first Black woman to serve on the Fort Worth City Council.

Just like many of the constituents I serve, Ms. Barbour was a product of the segregated I.M. Terrell High School in Fort Worth. Ms. Barbour graduated from I.M. Terrell in 1937 and went on to earn her bachelor's degree from Prairie View A&M University and her master's degree from Atlanta University in Georgia.

Ms. Barbour served on the Fort Worth City Council from 1977 to 1979. During her tenure on the council, she advocated for a health clinic that now sits in the Stop Six community, which is where she lived; for summer food programs for low-income children; for recreational facilities for the community; and she cleared the way for the first fire station in the Stop Six-Eastwood area on Ramey Avenue and Edgewood Terrace.

Ms. Barbour is survived by her daughter, Hollie; her son, Robert Barbour, Jr.; as well as two grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring a true legend, Ms. Walter Barbour, who broke so many barriers at a time when women and African Americans faced so many obstacles, but she still worked hard to live the American Dream.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while I am very proud to represent Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, we woke up on Groundhog Day to a budget proposal that feels like the infinite loop—loaded with the same tax-and-spend policies that have not worked for the President or for the American people.

The President's budget proposal is a hard left U-turn that attempts to undo the three consecutive years of more responsible, less discretionary spending. While Congress only has the power of the purse, this budget altogether ignores our staggering national debt, which is more than $18.1 trillion.

Despite $2.1 trillion in proposed tax increases, President Obama's budget never balances—ever. Since 2009, $7.5 trillion has been added to the national debt, and expenditures amount to more than $21.1 trillion. The President's budget request recommends adding a staggering additional $8.5 trillion to the debt.

Mr. Speaker, we need smart budgeting to fund our priorities without doing harm to families, small businesses, and future generations. The American people deserve no less.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week, President Obama unveiled his fiscal year 2016 budget, which outlines his funding priorities for the year ahead.

This proposal builds on the economic progress we have made by properly focusing on middle class initiatives, and it supports initiatives that create jobs, educate young people, increase access to affordable child care, repair our crumbling roads and bridges, and keep communities safe—all to ensure that the American economy works for everyone and that recovery reaches all Americans.

The President's proposal is a strong starting point for Congress to work together to produce a smart and sensible budget that reflects the priorities of working Americans, that keeps our country safe and our economy growing.

I urge my Republican colleagues to drop their misguided proposals that benefit special interests, that repeal the Affordable Care Act, and that restrict women's health care decisions, and to focus instead on a bipartisan

budget agreement that ensures all Americans share in our country's growing recovery and that makes the right investments for our future.

TAXPAYERS RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe the American people deserve to know how their hard-earned tax dollars are spent. That is why I introduced the Taxpayers Right-to-Know Act.

Congress is known for its complex bills, but this one is pretty simple. It requires each Federal agency to provide taxpayers an annual report card of what they are doing with the money they have been given. With a government this large it is no secret we have waste and duplication. By better tracking government spending, we can look back and identify the outdated programs that should be eliminated or streamlined to save money.

As the people's representatives, we are here to be responsible stewards of their tax dollars, and this bipartisan bill is a good start to stopping wasteful spending.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass legislation that limits the role of money in politics. Since the Citizens United decision in 2010, the role of fundraising and spending in political campaigns has gotten even more out of control than it was before.

That is why I introduced a constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 24, which allows Congress and the States to rein in campaign contributions. It is also why I cosponsored the DISCLOSE Act, the Government By the People Act, and the democracy for all amendment—all designed to limit the influence of money in our political system.

The American people need to know that their elected officials are here to serve them and not big campaign contributors. The overwhelming amount of money spent on campaigns weakens people's faith in our political system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge House leadership to take up legislation to address this issue. We need to change our laws to get money out of politics and to keep our focus where it belongs—doing the right thing for the American people.

SUPPORTING OUR ALLIES

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, with the rise of ISIS—or ISIL—in Syria and Iraq, we have seen the brutality of Islamic extremism to an extent previously unimaginable.

In just the last week, ISIL beheaded two Japanese citizens and revealed that a Jordanian pilot had been burned alive in a cage. This is why it is more critical than ever that we support our moderate allies in the region and praise their efforts to protect religious minorities.

In Egypt, President el-Sisi recently became the first modern leader in the country's history to visit a Coptic Christian church on Christmas Eve. The cathedral he visited had been attacked just 2 years earlier by Islamic extremists. By contrast, in regions controlled by ISIL, groups that have lived in the same community for more than 1,000 years have been killed or have fled for their lives.

We must never forget that the mission of the extremists is not regional but global dominance, and it is aimed at all who refuse to submit to their harsh interpretation of their religion. We must stand together with leaders like the King of Jordan and the President of Egypt, who speak up and act to defeat Islamic extremism, and give them our strong support.

VACCINATIONS

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, once again, our country is seeing the dangerous effects of failing to listen to science.

In 2000, the United States had effectively eliminated endemic measles—an effort 40 years in the making—but all of that progress is quickly coming undone, not by an act of nature but by willful ignorance.

Last year, there were 644 cases of measles in the United States—the highest number in 20 years. Already this year, there have been 102 cases in 14 States, including in my home State of Illinois.

This is a dangerous game and one that some elected officials are encouraging. As leaders, it is our duty to inform the public of the truth. For those of us with scientific and medical backgrounds, this duty falls even more seriously.

When you fail to vaccinate, it is not just yourself and your children that you are putting in danger; it is everyone you come into contact with. And when politicians give voice to misinformation and paranoia, they are putting us all at risk.

Measles may not spread as fast as erroneous sound bites and tweets, but they both have the potential to cause a great amount of damage.

I know that many of my colleagues have reminded us that they are not scientists as they use this as an excuse for their advocacy of bad public policy, but it does not take a scientist to realize that opposing vaccines is wrong.

Absent a valid medical reason for exclusion, vaccines are critical for every man, woman, and child in our country—period.

NATIONAL CANCER PREVENTION DAY

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the important health care issues surrounding the National Cancer Prevention Day.

This day is an opportunity for health care providers, policymakers, and other community leaders to educate people on the healthy activities and behaviors that can prevent this disease. While we learn more and more every year about how to best treat cancer, more must be done to focus on preventing cases from ever occurring. Today is a reminder to patients to make it their business to learn of activities and behaviors to decrease the incidence of this disease.

As a doctor who treated patients in northern Michigan for over 30 years, I am far too familiar with the devastating impact that cancer has on countless lives every day. I hope that all of my colleagues in the House and the Senate will join me in the 114th Congress to remember the victims of cancer, to honor its survivors, and to do everything in our power to prevent future cases of this disease.

PROVIDING TRAVEL BENEFITS FOR VICTIMS OF MILITARY SEXUAL TRAUMA

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to again partner with my colleague JACKIE WALORSKI from Indiana to reintroduce legislation to extend veterans' travel benefits to veterans who are traveling to seek treatment for injuries resulting from sexual trauma in the military.

It is an honor to serve with Mrs. WALORSKI on the Veterans' Affairs Committee—one of the most bipartisan committees in the House—and it is a privilege to work with all of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, in service to our Nation's veterans. We must ensure that victims can access the high-quality care that every veteran is guaranteed when he or she joins the military.

The occurrence of sexual trauma in the military is outrageous enough, but it is something our brave servicemen and -women should never be forced to experience. What is even worse is that many survivors of military sexual trauma have trouble accessing the physical and mental health services they need when they return home because the VA does not provide travel benefits to all victims of MST.

This legislation is a great first step in further protecting the thousands of servicemen and -women who are survivors of military sexual violence. I urge its swift passage.

□ 1230

HONORING ANDY CREWS

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent and friend who was recently named the 2015 Time Magazine Dealer of the Year. Andy Crews, president and CEO of AutoFair, is one of the Nation's most successful auto dealers, with seven stores and 600 employees in the Granite State and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Not only is Andy a natural business leader, he is also an outstanding public servant. He has served in the United States Marine Corps and constantly gives back to the future leaders of our communities.

In addition to donating proceeds of auto sales to help feed the needy around Thanksgivingtime, Andy has spearheaded a program to motivate high school seniors in Manchester, New Hampshire, to excel in their classes for a chance to win a car.

Andy also works closely with the New Hampshire community technical colleges to ensure students are receiving the best education and training to become the next generation of trained auto technicians.

It is people like Andy Crews who make me beyond proud to call myself a Granite Stater. His commitment and passion to the auto industry and our communities are beyond deserving of the 2015 Time Magazine Dealer of the Year award, and I wish him continued success.

WE MUST NOT NEGLECT BOKO HARAM

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last April I was horrified when hundreds of girls were kidnapped by Boko Haram in Nigeria because they attended school.

To this day, Boko Haram continues their reign of terror. In early January, thousands of Nigerians were slaughtered by these terrorists; and these attacks continue, with thousands and thousands of civilians killed since then as well.

With all of the attention focused on ISIS and al Qaeda, do not continue to neglect this issue. Mr. Speaker, we can not and must not forget about the unspeakable horrors being perpetuated by Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, Black lives matter. That is why I am supporting the Jubilee Campaign's Education After Escape initiative, which provides scholarships to the young girls that escaped Boko Haram.

I am working to support these brave young girls who, despite the horrors they witnessed, maintain dreams of success. They still want and deserve an education.

Mr. Speaker, we have to support the victims of Boko Haram just like we support the victims of other terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, we have to continue to tweet so that the world will know and understand that we are supporting those victims. Tweet #BringBackOurGirls and #JoinRepWilson. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

HONORING CAROL MANNING

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, the Orange County Alzheimer's Association will honor four individuals for their extraordinary contributions to advancing research and providing care for this debilitating disease. One of them is Carol Manning, and I would like to add my voice to the chorus of praise for her philanthropic work.

I first met Carol 35 years ago. She and Everett were struggling to raise a family and make ends meet, and yet she still made time to volunteer for many civic endeavors. Today, Carol is president and CEO of TMS, Inc., Print Systems, a $30 million enterprise. And, yes, she and Everett did build that business from scratch with a lot of long hours and hard work and personal sacrifice.

Carol still puts in those long hours, and yet she still makes time for so many worthy causes, Alzheimer's research being just one. On behalf of all of the people whose lives she has made better, I am honored to say thank you, Carol Manning.

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS WAIT PATIENTLY FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has had 4 years to bring an immigration bill—any immigration bill—to a vote and yet has failed to do so.

Oregon businesses, labor, farmers, farmworkers, faith-based groups, and human rights advocates have all patiently waited for comprehensive immigration reform. So have millions of Americans and people all across this Nation as they wait for their legal status to catch up with the realities of their lives as good and productive members of our society. Without comprehensive reforms, Oregon businesses are in peril and Oregon families live in constant fear.

Many of us in the House have offered a bipartisan bill similar to the Senate's with better border enforcement provisions, but hard-line, rightwing extreme provisions have hamstrung any action on these bills.

As a result of the intolerable congressional inaction, the President has issued executive orders to protect folks who have immigrated to this country and been productive members of society and the economy. This executive action merely prioritizes deportations for individuals who harm or pose a threat to our society.

My hope had been that this action would spur comprehensive immigration reform. Instead, House Republicans now play games with the Department of Homeland Security's appropriations and put us all at risk.

It is time to act.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for immigration reform. Our Nation is already beginning to see some of the great economic benefits of the DACA and DAPA programs, which I vow to do my best to protect here as we go through the Department of Homeland Security appropriations process.

The true benefits of immigration reform—which, according to the Congressional Budget Office, are over $200 billion in deficit reduction, finally securing and establishing security on our border, implementing mandatory workplace enforcement to prevent people who are here illegally from undermining the job market for Americans, and creating over 150,000 jobs for American citizens—can only be recognized if this body takes action and passes immigration reform.

We had a bill last session that would have passed the floor of the House, and it already passed the Senate. We begin anew. Rather than living in this Groundhog Day of repetitious repeals of ObamaCare, let's move forward on something that creates economic growth, jobs for Americans, and reduces our deficit. It is called immigration reform.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 527, SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 78 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 78

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-3. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-4, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 78 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, and H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act.

Mr. Speaker, every year bureaucrats in Washington impose thousands of regulatory mandates on local governments and small businesses. Those mandates can be costly, stretching city and State budgets and making it harder for American businesses to hire.

The Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, H.R. 50, will ensure that the people who write these regulations in Washington know exactly what they are asking the American people to pay and whether the cost of compliance might make it harder for family businesses to meet payroll and stay afloat.

H.R. 50 will force Washington to think carefully about regulatory costs before it passes them on to Americans. This bill is about transparency and accountability and is something Democrats and Republicans can all support.

In 1995, Congress passed the bipartisan Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, UMRA, legislation designed to prevent the Federal Government from imposing unfunded mandates onto State and local governments or private businesses without policymakers or the public knowing the cost of such policies.

UMRA's main objective was to force the Federal Government to estimate how much unfunded mandates would cost local governments and businesses and rein in out-of-control mandates. UMRA ensured public awareness of the crushing financial burden of Federal mandates on employers and State and local governments. However, UMRA has not been amended since 1995, and some subtle changes are needed to preserve and improve on the Act's initial purposes.

□ 1245

UMRA was a good bill, but over time, some shortcomings became apparent such that the Clinton and, later, Obama administrations issued executive orders to fix the loopholes within it.

H.R. 50 has bipartisan DNA, Mr. Speaker. It codifies those administrative fixes championed by Presidents Clinton and Obama and promotes good government, accountability, and transparency.

As a testament to this fact, the bill is cosponsored by two of my Democratic colleagues here in the House, Representatives COLLIN PETERSON and LORETTA SANCHEZ. I owe them a debt of gratitude for their efforts in promoting this commonsense bill.

The text of H.R. 50 has passed the House on a bipartisan basis three times in the 112th and 113th Congresses. The bill most recently was favorably reported by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

A common refrain in this business is that ''nobody wants to see how the sausage is made,'' meaning that the process of drafting and passing legislation is so ugly that it would repulse people. In this case, I disagree.

I am extremely proud of this bill, and I am proud of the process by which it has been advanced in the House. I have had the pleasure of working with colleagues from both sides of the aisle on this measure, and I appreciate their support and counsel.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 was a model for bipartisanship, and my hope is that this bill leaves a similar legacy. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of this aisle to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, Dr. FOXX, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also express through you my wishes for her recovery, and I also appreciate her patriotism in doing her duty to God and country here today despite her respiratory duress. I hope that goes

noted, that she is doing a great job representing her party on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act and the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act.

The titles of these bills, while lengthy, seem to suggest that somehow these efforts are designed to increase transparency or help small business. Their actual impact is quite frankly the opposite.

By allowing rules to be written behind closed doors by big businesses and effectively preventing Federal agencies from promoting the national interests as they are supposed to and adding additional bureaucratic red tape and paperwork, these bills represent an assault on the health and safety of our Nation's families and threaten to drown our government in mountains and mountains of unnecessary paperwork.

I think that the release of the President's budget this week shows a contrast between the priorities of both parties' agendas. The President's budget focused on Main Street, offering new ideas for how we can meet the infrastructure needs of our country and reform our corporate tax system to make American businesses more competitive.

Unfortunately, what we continue to see here in this body from the Republicans is a ''Groundhog Day'' scenario where every day, every week—it is like the movie—we are talking about the same thing over and over again.

We have acted on repealing the Affordable Care Act 56 times in this body. Here, we are back with another set of bills that echo other bills again and again and again.

Now, I understand why many people want to do this once and go through it. People ran on repealing ObamaCare, and people ran on passing these bills. Once they are done, we will see what the other body does.

But to keep coming back, rather than dealing with the critical national priorities, I think simply shows a detachment from reality. That is one of the reasons the public holds this body in such low regard.

The bill that we considered 2 weeks ago added 65 new analytical requirements to the process of rulemaking—more red tape, more hurdles. I think what we are seeing here today is maybe that is not enough red tape. We are now looking at bills that allow big business to weigh in before the public, creating even more hurdles before regulations become public and are implemented.

H.R. 50 would effectively require agencies to consult with the private sector before the public is even made aware of the bill, let alone engaged in the rulemaking. This blocks transparency and handicaps public input.

I agree we want to make sure that business has the opportunity to weigh in, but we want to make sure that every stakeholder in a rulemaking process has the opportunity to weigh in equally.

In my State of Colorado, I would be concerned about the erosion of our protection of our great natural areas like Rocky Mountain National Park which is a protected site. We celebrated its 100th anniversary as a national park just last week.

In those 100 years, the Rocky Mountains have been thriving. If you visit the park today, you can find streams, elk, bighorn sheep, and fields of wildflowers; but if we hadn't designated the park a national treasure and created a comprehensive management plan for its protection, we might very well have lost not only something that relates to our national pride and is beautiful but, frankly, is the economic driver in Estes Park and Grand County for much of the economic activity in and around the National Park.

H.R. 50 would threaten the ability of the National Park Service to create the kind of management plan that the economy has thrived under in my home State of Colorado and in my district. It would essentially create a veto power for legislators and interests that don't believe in the protection of public lands or are willing to threaten the health of our families for enhancement of their bottom line. There is always going to be somebody that objects.

Again, we have a thriving tourism economy relating to Rocky Mountain National Park, but I am sure there is some company somewhere that would have some interest that is countervailing to the interests of job creation in our community, and that is why we need to have a transparent and accessible process of listening to stakeholders in as expeditious a way as possible.

We need a system that allows the Fort Collins native who hikes through the Rockies every weekend or the New Yorker who visits the snowcapped mountains every spring the ability to participate in protecting those natural resources and the protection of our public health.

We need to listen to the small businesses, the hospitality sector, and the restaurants and lodges that serve our tourism communities, but by allowing an unfair advantage to out-of-State corporate interests, we threaten the very principle that makes us American, the ability to participate in our decisions of government at the level closest to where we are affected.

H.R. 50 is a dangerous precedent for policy. It allows additional red tape to be thrown at government agencies, representing unnecessary delays and costs that prevent us from creating jobs and growing our economy.

We need to move forward with a middle class agenda for our country rather than continuing to live in this Groundhog Day scenario of repetitious bills that don't discuss how to grow our economy or grow the middle class.

Yesterday, this body attempted to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 56th time. Today, the Republicans are making two attempts at what I consider to be a very similar thing, damage the regulatory process at all costs, which we already did and we are doing again.

They want to see additional red tape and bureaucracy added—whether it is clean air, whether it is clean water, whether it is consumers, whether it is protecting our children—regardless of the particular area with which we operate.

Instead of having a cumulative look at regulations, we should have a look at cumulative impacts of all the legislation that has been brought before this body and how that impacts small businesses and regulations.

Earlier this year, the House passed the Regulatory Accountability Act. That bill alone added 65 new checkpoints to the regulatory process. This bill would prevent transparency and allow big business to weigh in on regulations—before small businesses, before consumers, before other stakeholders—and add an additional tier and red tape to the regulatory process.

We need to move forward with improving our regulatory structure. I don't think there is any disagreement about that. Some of that can be done through executive action and some in a collaborative, bipartisan way to streamline the regulatory process to reduce hurdles for small businesses while meeting the goals of protecting the American public. Unfortunately, these bills do neither of those.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for his kind comments about me and my health. I appreciate all condolences.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution also provides for consideration of H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015, which is important legislation to improve the Federal Government's treatment of small businesses.

Ensuring we are providing the best environment possible to small businesses is vital to support a sector which employs nearly half of America's private sector workers and generates 63 percent of new private sector jobs.

As a former owner of a nursery, I know well the joys and trials of running a small business, and I am pleased that the House is considering these vital provisions.

Small businesses do not have the staff or background to identify and comply with ever-growing piles of red tape. Federal regulations disproportionately impact small businesses which led Congress to enact the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires agencies to account better for

the impacts of proposed regulations on small businesses and other small entities and to tailor regulations to minimize adverse impacts on these entities.

Unsurprisingly, agencies have failed to comply with these requirements in full. They have taken advantage of loopholes, failed to acknowledge the entirety of impacts for proposed rules, and issued rules that continue to harm small businesses. That failure necessitates our actions this week to consider H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act.

This legislation requires Federal agencies to consider the potential ''economic impact'' of proposed rules on small businesses and nonprofits. It also mandates a 10-year plan to review all rules determined to have ''a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.''

That will ensure past regulations will not remain on the books unexamined and able to burden small businesses for decades.

The legislation also expands ''regulatory flexibility analysis'' requirements which are currently used to explain the reasoning behind a proposed rule, identify duplicative rules, and explain any recordkeeping or other requirements that may be imposed on small businesses or other small entities.

It also requires the Small Business Administration's chief counsel for advocacy to develop interagency rules for conducting flexibility analyses.

These changes will ensure that future regulations are tailored to minimize their impact on small businesses. This will allow small businesses to spend more of their investments and time hiring new employees and growing their businesses rather than complying with unnecessary burdens from Federal regulations.

H.R. 527 is a simple, commonsense mandate for the executive branch to work together with small businesses and design smarter, less burdensome rules that work for the American people, and I commend it to my colleagues for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation that would help veterans make it in America by establishing a pilot program to encourage the hiring of veterans in manufacturing jobs.

To discuss our thoughtful proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a leader on veterans issues.

Ms. DELBENE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can consider my proposal to boost education and job training for our veterans.

Everyone in this Chamber can agree that we have an obligation to care for those who risk their lives and make sacrifices for our freedoms.

Unfortunately, there are too many veterans struggling to find work today, and we are not doing enough to help. Last year, the unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans stood at more than 7 percent, substantially higher than the national rate; and across all age groups, there were more than 500,000 veterans out of work in 2014.

This is unacceptable. Congress must do more to meet its commitment to these brave men and women. That is why I encourage my colleagues to join me and more than 40 of my colleagues in supporting the Manufacturing Jobs for Veterans Act.

My bill will establish State-based manufacturing employment programs to provide skills training in manufacturing jobs for veterans and servicemembers who are reentering the workforce.

These pilot programs would support on-the-job training opportunities, apprenticeships, and certification classes for unemployed veterans; and it will encourage manufacturers to recruit, hire, and train our Nation's heroes.

With as many as 600,000 unfilled manufacturing jobs, we have an opportunity to connect employers with a pipeline of skilled, capable workers.

□ 1300

Instead of voting on yet another partisan bill, we should be focused on real solutions that help the American people, grow our economy, and strengthen the middle class. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can take up this important bill and put our veterans back to work.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, and I thank my good friend from North Carolina, who, as has already been stated on the floor, is powering through today, standing strong for the values that I think really would not be expressed any differently except to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is critical national interest here.

There is probably today, on the floor, as we talk about these bills—and yes, it is sort of a Groundhog Day, and I will get to that in a moment, because it seems like every time we, from the Republican side of the aisle, want to talk about jobs and kitchen tables and making better improvements for life and getting rid of regulatory burdens that would help or putting controls on government, we are accused of wanting to spoil the environment, kill trees, make flowers not bloom, I mean, whatever it may be, but the issue, that is Groundhog Day.

So if people want a true Groundhog Day analogy, here is the Groundhog Day analogy. The analogy is, when we want to put constraints on government from interfering and getting in the way of its proper role of helping business and helping our country do what it is supposed to do, or we are wanting to control, through government, this process and do so in a way that is detrimental to those moms and dads who get up every day and families and single moms and grandparents and aunts and uncles, all these folks who just simply say, we are not really as overly concerned about what you are doing in Washington, D.C., as I am concerned about what you are doing in Hometown, USA, where I get up every morning.

It has been said many times, Mr. Speaker, already this afternoon, and the issue is, we are putting more burden and red tape on America.

No. What this bill does—and these two bills that I speak in favor of in this rule, these two bills that we are doing, H.R. 50 and H.R. 527—is actually controlling government. Instead of letting it get in the way and put unnecessary or quicker burdens on those again, we are simply saying, Whoa. There is a proper place. There is a proper place for regulation. There is a proper place for a limited government role that our Founders made.

However, when that role steps over and begins to not only burden business but instead the man or woman who wants to get up in the morning and chase a dream of starting a new business, as I once did, when we started a scrapbook store, you know, just to get a little bit of money, we were able to do so.

But others who want to go get a loan, they have to go through the bureaucratic red tape that is now keeping them from starting the small business jobs that employ people on a day-to-day level. We are simply saying, Government, it is time to take a breath. It is time to step back and see the impact that you are having.

Granted, some regulation is good. I will give that to my Democratic colleagues. But overregulation and burdensome regulation tears down our economy.

So if that is the Groundhog Day argument for this week we want to have, I will have it every day of the week. The Members and people who watch this floor can see you have a party that wants to restrict business and jobs and government in such a way that it throttles the economy or a party which is putting forth solutions and will put forward as many times as we have to to remind the American people that it is people and small business and jobs, the everyday Americans who create the jobs in this country, not government.

A business owner that I just recently spoke to had 10 employees, and he said he was getting ready to hire another employee. I said, Well, great. That is great. 10 percent growth. One more employee.

He said, But you have got to understand. I am having to hire somebody, and all they are going to be doing is filling out government paperwork.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is not someone who can go out and sell

their widget or perform their service. This is someone who will sit in an office and simply make sure that they are complying with the Big Brother overreach of government. That is not job creation. That is burdensome on business.

Let's get them where they can create jobs and go out and sell their product, do their services.

We have a bank in my area. You are talking about unfunded mandates, regulatory rulemaking. A bank in my area, on their regular regulatory inspection, they were waiting for the bank examiners to come, the folks to come in and do their audit.

The problem they had was this: when the government showed up, they had more people coming to inspect their books than they had employed in their main office. And the government agency complained that they did not have enough room for them to do their job.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. It is not up to small business to make sure government can do its job. It is up to government to provide the atmosphere so small business can do its job, and that is what we are here about today.

So when we look at this, I urge my colleagues, don't get sidetracked on other issues. Look at it for what it is. It is government getting the constraint, not the American people. It is protecting the American people from not good legislation, good litigation. It is the stuff that we need to work on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I state these are good bills. Let's state it clearly. Groundhog Day is exactly what it is: for government, or let's let the people live.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding this time and for her good work on this legislation.

I came to the floor today just to tell you a little bit about why I think this legislation is so very important.

When I first came to Congress many years ago, we had a Democratic Governor of Tennessee, Ned Ray McWherter, and he was a fine Governor. He would have the Tennessee congressional delegation to the Governor's mansion once a year. And he would always start those meetings off—every single year he would say: Please, no more unfunded mandates. Please, no more unfunded mandates.

He said that most of what the State was having to do now were things that were required by the Federal Government, and it was causing the States great financial difficulties, and it was turning what was supposed to be a Federal system that our Founding Fathers envisioned, it was turning it totally upside down.

This bill is a very reasonable, moderate, commonsense effort to make good on the original Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. All it is trying to do is ensure that Congress and Federal agencies are fully informed about the impact of these Federal mandates.

I urge my colleagues to support this very fine effort to make our system better.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

When you hear the gentleman from Georgia or the gentlewoman from North Carolina talk about the intent behind these bills, they sound great. We all want a streamlined regulatory process and to help make it more efficient.

Unfortunately, when you look at what these bills do, they do the opposite. They add another tier to regulation, with Big Business having a new say in and above what small businesses and community members can do. They add red tape and legal requirements to regulation that don't exist now under statute.

It, again, seems to me like the opposite of trying to get input so our regulations best affect the needs of each community, and we have diverse needs across this country.

My district is 62 percent Federal land, so when decisions are made on Federal land, like a travel management plan, and on where people can bike and where they can hunt and fish, we want to have our say. The last thing we want is some out-of-state corporate interest determining in some process before we even get our say on how these Federal lands are used.

It is absolutely critical that we empower our communities, and this bill does the opposite in the name of adding more bureaucracy and red tape to the regulatory process, presumably, in an attempt to delay or make it less effective than it is.

Now, we value, as Americans, the work that the Clean Water Act does, the Clean Air Act, the EPA, our essential protections around public health. They are very, very important. And I think our colleagues agree that they don't want to take those on head on.

But this bill would prevent some of those very agencies from doing the work that we have charged them to do, keeping our air clean, our water clean, and they need to be able to do that work and involve local impact in making sure that they do it in a way that protects American health and helps grow our economy and create jobs.

We need to make sure that we don't have dumping of industrial waste in the Colorado River, poisoning millions of recreational users. We want to make sure that drilling sites don't use chemical compounds that are toxic or cause birth defects.

We can and we must do better. The march of science moves forward. If there are thoughtful improvements to the regulatory process that will help reduce costs and reduce red tape, rather than add red tape, we are happy to have those discussions. But, unfortunately, these bills fall short of that mark. That is why I oppose the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. My colleague, Ms. DELBENE, has offered a concept around a pilot program to encourage the hiring of veterans in manufacturing jobs, the type of middle class agenda that the American public wants this Congress to work on, rather than one that cuts them out of the very rulemaking that is designed to protect us Americans from our health hazards and protect our public lands.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' defeat the previous question, vote ''no'' on the rule and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that Republicans are not opposed to regulations. We just want regulations to be done right.

These are modest reforms, supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. Some of these changes merely codify executive orders issued by the last two Democrat Presidents.

Mr. Speaker, as proud as I am of this legislation, I realize its passage today won't be front-page news. I understand that ''Lawmakers Band Together to Close Technical Loopholes in UMRA'' isn't exactly a riveting headline. But what we are doing here is important.

In Congress, we often focus our energy and attention on those issues that are most divisive and controversial, and I understand that. There are real, substantive disagreements between the two parties and among the American people.

But Congress must do the hard things. Every now and then, we get an opportunity to do something easy. This should be easy. Reforms in this bill are low-hanging fruit.

Some of my colleagues have suggestions for improvement and have offered amendments to these bills. Great. I welcome their suggestions.

Those amendments will be discussed in an open and transparent process. Not a single proposed amendment to either bill, Democrat or Republican, has been excluded by this rule.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join me in supporting these sensible bills that will enhance transparency, accountability, and awareness of Federal mandates and improve the Federal Government's treatment of small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 78 OFFERED BY MR. POLLS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 344) to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in manufacturing positions. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 344.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 174, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Chu (CA)
Curbelo (FL)
Duckworth
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Huffman
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lofgren
Lowey
Nolan
Nunnelee
Rangel
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

□ 1339

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 59 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 59 had I been present, I would have voted No.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call vote 59. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: Nay on roll call vote 59.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent earlier today during roll call vote 59. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on roll call vote 59, the motion on ordering the previous question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 50 and H.R. 527.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Benishek
Chu (CA)
Duckworth
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

□ 1348

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 60 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 59, ordering the previous question, I inadvertently voted ''yes.'' I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted, appropriately and properly, ''no.''

UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 78 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 50.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1352

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, with Mr. AMODEI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was referred to three other committees other than the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. We have been in contact with all of them—Judiciary, Budget, and Rules—and they have agreed to discharge the bill from their committees so that we can consider the bill on the floor today. I include for the RECORD those letters that reflect this understanding between Oversight and Government Reform and the three other committees.

Mr. Chairman, Congress enacted the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act to ''curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments.''

Twenty years later, we continue to see burdensome unfunded mandates being imposed on State, local, and tribal governments as well as small businesses. Despite high hopes, UMRA, as it is often referred to, had little effect on agency rulemaking because of its limited coverage and its lack of accountability.

In response, H.R. 50 proposes several key reforms to bring needed transparency to how government sets rules that protect our health, our safety, our welfare, as well as the environment. This legislation does this in several key ways.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 50 requires agencies to consult with the private sector when directly impacted by a proposed rule.

Consult with the private sector. That is a great theme. I love the title of this.

It does actually provide more information, more transparency, and engages those people that are affected by these rules. Requiring agency rulemakers to consult with small business owners will bring needed perspective and common sense to how our rules are made. Small businesses want the government to fully understand how regulations impact their ability to create jobs and promote economic growth. Of course we need rules. Of course there are going to be boundaries. But consulting with the private sector is something that has to happen, and government needs their perspective.

The bill makes independent agencies subject to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, also known as UMRA. There are hundreds of Federal independent agencies charged with handling responsibilities, such as managing workplace safety and protecting our forests. It is important these entities are accountable to the public when establishing a new rule. H.R. 50 ensures that that will happen.

H.R. 50 requires an UMRA analysis for all final rules. Under current law, an agency can forgo an UMRA analysis by avoiding a notice of proposed rulemaking. GAO reports that 35 percent of major rules are issued without a notice of proposed rulemaking, making it difficult for the public to comment.

In fiscal year 2014, the administration estimated the annual cost of major regulations between $57 billion and $84 billion. We must have a better understanding of those costs before passing them on to State, local, and tribal governments as well as the private sector.

The bill strengthens congressional oversight by requiring agencies to look back at specific regulations when requested by Congress. Before a rule is tested, it is difficult to understand its consequences, including its costs and its benefits. President Obama supported retrospective reviews of regulations by issuing an executive order requiring agencies to periodically review significant regulations, in Executive Order 13563, in January 2011. These retrospective reviews result in regulations that are more effective and less burdensome in achieving their objective. Retrospective analysis can and should inform future rules.

H.R. 50 allows judicial review when agencies fail to fully consider the least costly or least burdensome alternative rule. The bill allows the judicial branch to place a stay on rules when the agency fails to complete the required UMRA analysis. This provides an important check on the executive branch.

H.R. 50 codifies the Congressional Budget Office practice of estimating the true cost of a Federal mandate. When a Federal mandate is proposed, CBO ensures its cost estimates include lost profits, costs passed on to consumers, and behavioral changes as the result of a Federal mandate.

When enacted, UMRA created an important step to inform Congress of the potential burdens of regulatory mandates on both government and the private sector. This way, Congress could weigh any potential benefits as well as any potential burdens. By updating this law, we can help ensure that all parties, from government entities to small businesses, understand the true cost of prospective mandates.

I commend the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). She has poured her heart and soul into this. She believes passionately in this. Her leadership on this bill has brought it to this point today. It has passed three times with bipartisan support in this House, but it is necessary to bring it up again and to share this bill with a new Senate that is now in place.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 50. It is good. It is common sense. It is good for this Nation, and it enjoys bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 27, 2015, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported without amendment H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015, by a vote of 20 to 13. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Govemment Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask that you allow the Judiciary Committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 50, the ''Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015,'' which your Committee ordered reported on January 27, 2015.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 50, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration. The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 50 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would request that you include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 27, 2015, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported without amendment H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015, by a vote of 20 to 13. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on the Budget.

I ask that you allow the Budget Committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Budget represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on January 27, 2015.

In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 50, the Committee on the Budget will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

THOMAS PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2015.

Hon. PETER SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 27, 2015, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported without amendment H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015, by a vote of 20 to 13. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on Rules.

I ask that you allow the Rules Committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Rules represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: On January 27, 2015, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over rules and joint rules of the House.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 50. In addition, the Committee on Rules reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Rules for conferees on H.R. 50 or related legislation.

I also request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. This legislation may be well intended, but it would have unintended consequences that would make the government less efficient and less effective.

I stood here just 4 months ago when the House, for the second time, considered a package of special interest bills, including this one. I said then that the Republican leadership in the House cannot fool the American people by passing the same bad bills over and over again, yet, Mr. Chairman, here we go again.

Yesterday, the House voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 56th time. Today, we are considering an antiregulatory bill the House has considered three times before. Tomorrow, we will consider another antiregulatory bill the House has also passed before.

H.R. 50, the bill we are considering today, would add red tape to the rulemaking process in an effort to slow down or halt agency rules.

□ 1600

One thing that is different this time around is that the Congressional Budget Office estimated that H.R. 50 as reported would increase direct spending by $18 million over the next 10 years. CBO estimates that this increase would primarily impact the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, a bureau that was established to protect our constituents.

The majority inserted a last-minute provision last night after the Rules Committee meeting to address this problem. The majority's fix, however, does nothing to reduce the cost of the bill.

The majority instead inserted language to cut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's budget by $36 million in fiscal year 2016. Cutting CFPB's budget by $36 million while also requiring the agency to comply with significant new requirements is absurd.

On Saturday, The Huffington Post published an article titled, ''Congress Revives Gingrich-Era Law to Thwart Obama.'' The article said:

> Republicans in Congress aim to revamp an antiregulatory law from the Newt Gingrich era in an effort to paralyze new financial, environmental, and labor rules with a never-ending string of court challenges.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act was enacted as a part of Newt Gingrich's Contract with America. Even in the context of the extreme agenda of the Contract with America, Congress included several limitations in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

This bill would repeal those limitations. For example, under this bill, agencies would be required to consult with regulated industries on proposed rules before they are even made public.

For example, if the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau planned to propose a new rule to protect consumers from abusive mortgage practices, banks would get advance access to the rule and the opportunity to shape it before our constituents, the consumers.

I believe that businesses should have the opportunity to provide comments on proposed rules, but they should do it through the normal public comment process just like other stakeholders.

H.R. 50 would also expand judicial review under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. The statute currently prohibits courts from using its requirements to delay or invalidate a rule.

This bill eliminates that restriction which would allow regulated industries to use the law to slow down rulemakings.

This bill also would put independent agencies in jeopardy of political interference. The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act currently exempts independent agencies from its reporting requirements. The bill removes that exemption.

That would mean that the independent regulatory agencies like the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau would have to submit their rules to the Office of Management and Budget for review which could undermine their independence.

Section 12 of the bill would require an agency to perform retrospective review, including an additional cost-benefit analysis of any existing rules if requested by the chairman or ranking member of a committee. It is interesting that we always talk about being able to predict what is going to go on in the business world. This certainly would add a high level of unpredictability.

I will offer an amendment at the appropriate time to strike that provision. These flaws are reason enough to oppose this bill.

The most important reason is that we rely on agency rulemakings to protect our children, protect our workers, protect our economy, and protect our constituents, the folks who sent us here.

That is why the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards—a group of more than 150 good government, labor, scientific, faith, health, and community organizations—sent a letter to the Oversight Committee opposing this bill.

Here is what the letter said: ''The costs of deregulation should be obvious by now: the Wall Street economic collapse, various food and product safety recalls, and numerous disasters, including the recent Dan River coal ash spill in North Carolina and the Freedom Industries chemical spill in West Virginia, demonstrate the need for a regulatory system that protects the public, not corporate interests.''

Congress should be moving forward to protect the public from harm, not rolling back the clock and weakening important safeguards.

Yesterday, the White House issued a statement opposing this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX, the prime sponsor of this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time and for the leadership he has provided in getting this bill passed out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to probably have to say this many times today, but our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to make this an antiregulation bill. We are not opposed to regulations on our side of the aisle. We are in favor of commonsense rules.

Mr. Chairman, each year, Washington imposes thousands of pages of rules and regulations on America's private sector employers, as well as State and local governments. Buried in those pages are costly Federal mandates that make it harder for businesses to hire and cash-strapped States, counties, and cities to serve their citizens.

As a former State senator, I can testify to the difficulty of balancing the State's budget when there are dozens of complicated, mostly unfunded Federal mandates that must be taken into account.

As a former small business owner, I understand firsthand the concerns that job creators have about how lengthy, confusing rules affect their ability to conduct business and provide jobs and opportunities to their employees.

That is why I introduced H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, which we call UMITA, and am proud to see it brought before the House for consideration.

The bill builds upon the bipartisan 1995 Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, also known as UMRA, and will ensure awareness and public disclosure of the cost in dollars and jobs that Federal dictates pose to the economy and local governments.

H.R. 50 does not seek to prevent the Federal Government from regulating; rather, it seeks to ensure that its regulations are deliberative and economically defensible. Asking regulators to consider thoroughly and understand the cost of a rule in addition to its benefits should not be controversial. It is just plain common sense.

Regulators and legislators should know exactly what they are asking the American people to pay and whether the costs of compliance might make it harder for family businesses to meet payroll and stay afloat. No government body, on purpose or accidentally, should skirt public scrutiny when jobs and scarce resources are at stake.

In the nearly 20 years since UMRA's passage, weaknesses in the law have been revealed, weaknesses that some government agencies and independent regulatory bodies have exploited. UMITA makes independent regulatory agencies subject to UMRA's requirements, ending a two-tier system that allowed regulations to be implemented without the required consideration, scrutiny, or public input.

H.R. 50 recognizes that the Federal Government's reach extends well beyond the taxes it collects and the money it spends. Regulations can advance government initiatives without using tax dollars.

Rather than count expenses for new programs, the government can require the private sector, as well as State and local governments, to pay for Federal initiatives through compliance costs. This bill shines much-needed light on the murky regulatory process and ensures the public has transparent access to proposed rules and regulations.

Both Democrats and Republicans recognize that appropriate regulations don't need to be issued in the dead of night or negotiated behind closed doors. That is why the House has considered and passed this bill three times in the 112th and 113th Congresses.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this commonsense, bipartisan bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act.

This act boasts an Orwellian title that attempts, I think, deception of the public into believing that it is simply an innocuous attempt to enhance transparency for the public and State and local governments while masking the true nature of this act which—make no mistake—is a subversive legislative assault of public health, safety, and environmental protections.

This bill is simply an effort to throw a wrench into the rulemaking process, ensuring that private industry is provided privileges and rights above any other stakeholder in the process.

In many respects, H.R. 50 represents the ''Mitt Romney principle'' on steroids, for it appears that in the minds of some of my colleagues, not only is it a fact that ''corporations are people, my friend,'' but under this measure, they appear to be embracing an ethos that treats corporations even better than people.

My longstanding principle is that I will never defend the indefensible, and regrettably, this bill provides private corporations with an unfair consultation over every other stakeholder in the regulatory process, and that is indefensible.

Under this bill, Federal agencies would be required to consult with private industry ''before issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking,'' yet it does not afford that same level of protection or consultation to average citizens, consumers, or anybody else who relies on agency rules to preserve and protect their health, welfare, and safety.

There is no justification for enacting an irrational statutory framework that requires the Federal Government to consult with private firms and nobody else—such as a large agribusiness, for example—prior to proposing a rule that could have an impact on that company, yet does not require such consultation on public health with public health experts.

I cannot defend a regulatory framework that would provide big oil companies a guaranteed right to weigh in before any drilling regulation is promulgated to protect the public from big oil

spills, such as one we experienced just a few years ago.

To be clear, I strongly support the right of industry to have its voice and to have the opportunity to provide comments on proposed rules. This fosters more informed and high-quality rulemaking, benefiting business and society; indeed, that is why our current administrative procedures mandate that a public comment period be provided prior to the adoption of such rules.

Equally concerning, H.R. 50 would also undermine the critical independence of aptly titled independent regulatory agencies. It is not clear how eliminating the independence of agencies, such as the Consumer Product Safety Commission, by empowering Presidential administrations to play a significant role in shaping the rules for those agencies before they issue them, would in any way address unfunded mandates.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONNOLLY. The bottom line is that well-reasoned agency rules have made our air cleaner to breathe, water safer to drink, and our products safer to use. That is a good formula, and we should preserve it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

It would be inaccurate and inappropriate to suggest that this bill bypasses individuals. To the contrary, the bill says, ''and impacted parties within the private sector.'' The definition of ''private sector'' under UMRA—the term ''private sector'' means ''all persons or entities in the United States, including individuals.''

Any assertion on this floor that this gives unilateral priority to the individual corporations and bypasses the individuals, we are trying to give people who are affected by these rules—we are trying to give them the opportunity to be heard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for allowing me time.

I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 50. I consider it a misguided bill that will cost American consumers at least $18 million over the next 10 years while making it easier for bad actors in certain industries to continue their abusive practices as they attempt to stonewall appropriate regulation.

□ 1415

Make no mistake. H.R. 50 is a frontal assault on the Nation's health, safety, and environmental protections, and it would erect new barriers to give selected industries a built-in advantage to evade or eliminate vital rules that protect the American people.

For instance, this bill would require agencies to consult with private sector entities ''as early as possible, before the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking, continue through the final rule stage, and be integrated explicitly into the rulemaking process.''

Now, I agree that Federal agencies should consult with regulated industries regarding proposed rules, but they should not receive an insider, prewired advantage in the regulating and rulemaking process over other stakeholders.

H.R. 50 would also expand judicial review under UMRA and would allow a court to review the inadequacy or failure of an agency to prepare a written statement under UMRA. UMRA currently prohibits courts from using the law to stay, invalidate, or otherwise affect an agency rule. H.R. 50 would eliminate this prohibition.

I thought the majority strongly opposed judicial activism, but perhaps that only applies to protecting voting rights.

We don't have to choose between protecting the health, welfare, and safety of Americans and promoting economic growth, job creation, and innovation. We can do both. H.R. 50 advances neither of these worthy goals, and that is why I urge my colleagues to reject this deeply flawed act that will stack the deck against the American consumer.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding his time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act.

The alarming growth of our Federal Government in the last several decades has come at an incredible cost. This is largely due to lax reporting requirements, and as a result, the American people have largely been left in the dark as to the true cost of this unprecedented growth. For example, we all know that, often, the Federal Government imposes mandates, be it upon the private sector or local or State governments, and, oftentimes, this is without any clearly disclosed cost or impact of those mandates.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 50 will make significant strides to address this looming problem by enacting more strict and clearly defined requirements about how and when agencies need to disclose the cost of these Federal mandates. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 50.

With all due respect to my friend from Utah—and I do respect him; I know he didn't write this bill—there is a common practice here in Congress that you name the bill in a way that describes the opposite of what it will actually do. This is supposed to be an accountability bill, but this bill ought to be named the ''Government Gridlock Act'' because that is what it will introduce.

While I certainly respect everyone's opinion and position against Big Government—I certainly understand that. You can be against intrusive government. I understand that. But you can't be against a functioning government, and that is what this bill accomplishes.

This bill, as the gentleman did point out, does allow individual taxpayers to sue. Mrs. Gilhooly and Mr. Gilhooly can sue, but so can Exxon and so can JPMorgan Chase attack regulations under this bill. This bill makes the financial ability to sustain a legal challenge as the litmus test on how much justice you get under this bill.

Even though Congress has the ability to pass laws and to direct regulators to come up with regulations, large, well-financed banks and industries like the oil industry will be able to undo the direction of Congress by proffering legal challenges with enormous resources to stop those laws from coming into effect.

A good example is the financial services industry, where we under Dodd-Frank have directed that there be 300 separate rules developed to deal with the problems created by the crisis in 2008. That crisis cost $20 trillion to the American economy. Yet, under this law, in order to prevent big banks from taking those reckless gambles, we would have to force the regulators to show that the reduction in cost to the American taxpayer justified the regulation against Wall Street.

It misses the point. We are trying to bifurcate the risks created by Wall Street from the taxpayers' requirement to bail them out. This bill ignores that reality. I think we should all oppose it, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this bill and for bringing it through regular order. We continue to hear that around here on this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Massachusetts leaves, I think it is important that we address this. As the gentleman would indicate, he is making this out to be all about big banks, but it is really about the small business folks and, truly, about the municipalities. I want to read a few excerpts from the resolution that comes from his home State—from Massachusetts—because they got together, and they said this is a real problem:

''Whereas, the Federal Government has imposed additional requirements, based on incomplete scientific analysis

and review, on the cities and towns of Massachusetts.'' In this resolution, Mr. Chairman, it talks about going further and that, at a minimum, what we should do is provide a ''fiscal note included as part of any such proposal.''

So it is the towns and the counties across the country and, yes, indeed, from the gentleman—my esteemed friend from Massachusetts—a resolution from his State that talks about the problems that we have with unfunded mandates. Over 850 major pieces of regulation, with impacts of over $100 million a piece, have failed this basic principle and test, and 75 percent of them never get the analysis that we should be doing at the Federal Government.

We have a responsibility to the local towns and governments but also a responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to farmers. I left a hearing today with the EPA and an unfunded mandate. Who are they consulting with? The Department of Agriculture, not with the farmers from across this great country. They are talking to other bureaucrats. It is time that we bring the private sector in, and I think it is time that we stand alongside them.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a new member of our committee.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. Although the intent of this legislation is to, no doubt, provide additional safeguards, it does, in fact, add an additional level of bureaucracy.

It appears to be a good bill. As a former mayor, I fought to ensure that my city and other cities were not unduly impacted by unfunded Federal mandates. In Michigan, we worked cooperatively with our Federal counterparts on proposed regulations that would generate obligations on local governments. In fact, as a local government official, I supported the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act, as it was a result of multiple years of effort by our State and local government officials to control the burden of many unfunded Federal mandates.

Along with the consequences I have previously mentioned, this bill will also grant corporations special access to information about a rule and an opportunity to submit feedback to an agency before a rule is even proposed. Additionally, the legislation would shut the American people out of this early review. The bill would also require agencies to perform retrospective analysis at the request of any chairman or ranking minority member of any standing or select committee of the House or the Senate. The bill neither improves nor streamlines the regulatory process. It expands agency roles and interjects politics into the process.

The Office of Management and Budget is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. This bill also expands OMB's role, and it requires them to guarantee that each agency complies with the act's requirements. Independent regulatory agencies will then have to send their rulemaking analyses to OMB.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. The existing Unfunded Mandates Reform Act expressly prohibits courts from using the law to stay, enjoin, invalidate, or otherwise affect an agency rule. H.R. 50 would fundamentally change the law by eliminating this prohibition, allowing regulated industries to abuse this expanded judicial review and tie up rules in litigation for years.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this act, and I request that this body work within the existing safeguards in place.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there are many parts of government that like to act in secrecy. In particular, many agencies like to hide the true costs of their regulations from the American people. After all, it is easier to add more pages to the Federal Register if nobody is sure exactly what the pricetag is, but that is not the way our democracy should work. For government to work, it needs to be accountable to the people. To be accountable to the people, government needs to be honest and open with what it is doing.

Washington needs reform, and a good place to start is to make sure that people know the true cost of what Washington is doing—no gimmicks, no hidden fees. That is why I support Representative FOXX's bill, which demands transparency on unfunded mandates.

Mr. Chairman, this bill says a simple thing. It says we trust the people. It says if the bureaucracy is afraid of telling the people how much a regulation costs, then it shouldn't impose the regulation. If bureaucracy isn't following the rules and giving the people the information they need, this bill allows the courts to review the agency—no more hiding. The people have the right to know as much as possible, and Washington has an obligation to tell them.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to remind the gentleman before he leaves the Chamber that there is truth here. The truth is that the CBO has already estimated that this bill will cost some $18 million. There is also truth here with regard to what has happened to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—the very bureau that this Congress established to protect our consumers on a day-to-day basis—and its losing some $36 million. That is the transparency.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

□ 1430

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member, for this opportunity to speak.

I rise today also in opposition to H.R. 50, the misleadingly named Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015, which passed out of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on a strictly partisan vote.

This bill neither improves nor streamlines the regulatory process. Instead, this ill-conceived bill is an assault on consumer protections, gives private industry an unfair advantage to weigh in on rules, and erects new, unnecessary barriers in the regulatory process.

H.R. 50 would require agencies to provide the private sector with an unfair advantage to influence proposed regulations. The supporters of this bill claim that it creates parity between the private and the public sectors, but that is simply not true. What it really does is provide the private sector with a sneak peek of proposed rules before they are even made public.

This bill propels regulated private sector entities to the front of the line while pushing the consumers these laws are designed to protect to the back of the line. It further gums up the regulatory process by allowing opponents to delay or invalidate rules through litigation.

The existing Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 prohibits courts from using the law to stay, enjoin, invalidate, or otherwise affect an agency rule. H.R. 50 would fundamentally change that law by eliminating this prohibition, giving regulated industries the ability to abuse this expanded judicial review and tie up rules in courts for years. For example, Wall Street banks could take agencies to court over Dodd-Frank consumer protection rules that have yet to be finalized.

Most Americans, and certainly most of my constituents that I represent, simply do not have the means to hire lawyers to sue Federal agencies if they are dissatisfied with a Federal regulation, but large corporations do. H.R. 50 would give corporations the ability to sue and to stall regulations they view as unfavorable.

By unnecessarily layering an additional, burdensome judicial review and giving private industry an unfair advantage, this bill shows that it is not working for the consumers, but it is only working for the chosen few.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time left on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 15½ minutes remaining,

and the gentleman from Maryland has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, every day small businesses and local governments are weighed down by Washington's numerous regulations. H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, acts to curb the constant rules and regulations that Washington continues to impose on the American people.

This law builds on and improves the bipartisan legislation, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, which was enacted to promote transparent decisionmaking and curb unfunded Federal mandates. However, due to loopholes and exemptions, UMRA has failed to keep unfunded mandates off the backs of local governments and taxpayers.

I would like to thank Congresswoman FOXX for introducing this bipartisan legislation to close these gaps, hold Washington accountable, and better protect our fellow Americans.

Importantly, this bill will do three things: one, it will close loopholes that allow agencies and independent regulators to forgo UMRA analysis; two, it enables stakeholders to engage Federal agencies before unfunded mandates are implemented; and three, it holds regulators accountable through the courts and congressional oversight.

I am reminded every day that we were elected to bring change to Washington, and this reform is exactly what needs to be sent to the President's desk.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Maryland for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has a lot of chutzpah even for a probusiness majority. The point of the review and comment regulatory process is to hear from everybody, to pull everybody into the process.

I have experienced how this process worked when I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In order to make sure I heard from everyone, I took a process which issued guidelines, which did not come under the Administrative Procedure Act, and put it under the Administrative Procedure Act to make sure I heard from everyone.

In a real sense, I knew, I thought I knew what the public wanted because I was a civil rights lawyer. I was particularly interested in whether the reforms I was instituting would work in practice. So I was more interested, in a real sense, in what the business community said.

I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, in these processes, the business community, small and large, dwarfs the public in the amount of comment that agencies receive.

This bill breaks a cardinal rule by excluding, of all people, the public, while industry gets an advance look at a bill. Understand, it is the industry that is being regulated, industry that has the high-cost lobbyists, the high-cost lawyers that the public does not have.

So what is the point here, Mr. Chairman? It is clear. The point is to get industry in on writing the bill itself and writing it at that stage before the public even gets to know what the bill is. This is not a tilt in favor of the objects of regulations; it is a slide in their favor.

If the point is the usual bipartisan point, to help small businesses—which, by the way, is already a stakeholder—along with other businesses, why pit small businesses against small children and small mortgage holders and small IT users?

Another extraordinary thing I see in this bill is that the court-hating majority, at least in this bill, falls in love with the judiciary by inviting litigation before the rule is final. The courts will just love that. On top of everything else, this bill adds $18 million over 10 years to agency spending?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. $18 million that this majority certainly will not appropriate.

Small business always have been a bipartisan concern. We have many more of them in our districts than we have large businesses. Small businesses are not who will come to ''consult.'' It is the global multinationals who are applauding this bill as we speak.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point to the bill because it keeps getting repeated on this floor that it doesn't include the public, it doesn't include individuals. That is just not true.

On page 12 of the bill:

> Agencies shall, to the extent practicable, seek out the views of State, local, and tribal governments, and impacted parties within the private sector.

Definition of private sector: the term ''private sector'' means all persons or entities in the United States, including individuals.

It sounds like a good rhetorical point to keep saying: Oh, we are leaving out the little guy; we are leaving out the public. It does include the public; it does include the individuals; and when these unfunded mandates are placed upon them, this bill would make sure that they are at least asked about it. That is what we are seeking.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, the chairman points out very clearly that, indeed, the definition of ''private sector'' includes individuals. I would also like to go further and talk about small businesses.

We are talking about small businesses and how they are not supported in this. It is troubling, because if that were the case, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, who represents thousands and thousands of small businesses, or the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, which does the same, would not be endorsing this piece of legislation. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure the record is corrected.

With regards to the $18 million, that was cleared up in Rules yesterday; the committee was made aware of it. And despite the legislation being identical to last Congress' bill, the CBO had scored it as having a direct spending cost, but this was partly because the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, doesn't have the authority to collect the fees. And so we have already addressed that, Mr. Chairman, and I wanted to make sure we cleared up the record.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time that has been allotted to me. Thank you very much, Mr. CUMMINGS.

I rise to oppose H.R. 50, an anticonsumer deregulatory bill that would stop rulemaking by our Nation's financial overseers dead in its tracks. In 2008, we witnessed the worst financial crisis since 1929, which halted lending to small businesses, left millions without a home, and pushed countless Americans into personal bankruptcy and ruin, after which my colleagues and I in Congress worked diligently to put in place serious and comprehensive safeguards to prevent another collapse.

Nevertheless, today House Republicans are suffering from selective amnesia when they push this legislation to undo financial reform. Indeed, this bill, H.R. 50, places significant administrative hurdles on our regulators, like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Certain provisions require our regulators, who are tasked with protecting consumers and investors, to conduct onerous, industry-friendly, cost-benefit analysis and to submit their rules for review to the Office of Management and Budget. This hurts their ability to act independently and in the best interests of the public.

In addition, this bill would arm special interests with a time-tested weapon to delay and kill reform, the opportunity to challenge our cash-strapped regulators in court on every rule. But this is the ultimate point of the bill: to make regulating everything from securities, fraud, payday loans, credit cards, insider trading, and derivatives that much harder.

Most concerning is that Republicans want to pay for the cost of their new burdens by depriving the one regulator charged with protecting our Nation's

consumers of tens of millions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this is just the latest in a never-ending effort to unravel the important protections for consumers and taxpayers this Congress put in place following the worst crisis in a generation.

With our economy still recovering from the $14 trillion financial crisis, with families in my own district and probably yours still struggling with foreclosure and unsure how they will be able to make ends meet in retirement, we simply cannot undermine fundamental reforms or the agencies enforcing them.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make Mr. CUMMINGS aware that I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close, but I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to echo the comments of Ranking Member WATERS. As a member of the Committee on Financial Services, I am particularly concerned with the direction that this bill takes us at a time when, on one hand, many of my colleagues have criticized the agencies charged with implementation of important regulatory reforms, such as Dodd-Frank, charging those agencies with not bringing forth rules in a timely fashion, and then at the same time reducing, through the budget process, the necessary resources to provide those agencies with the tools that they need to move forward on the rulemaking process, and now this, yet another, I think, effort to create another cumbersome step in the process of developing rules intended to implement legislation that was passed here by the United States Congress, law that is on the books.

□ 1445

The rulemaking process already includes a very logical progression of steps which allows for a comprehensive and all-inclusive comment period under the Administrative Procedure Act that allows the kind of substantive input that is specific to the rules being proposed to be provided, to be considered, to modify proposed rules, and then to move forward in an orderly process.

The other concern that I have is that there is language that is troublesome to me in terms of the way cost-benefit analyses would be conducted and considered.

Very often—and there is no better example than in the financial sector—if we limit ourselves to industry-specific costs and benefits, we lose the fact that many of the costs are not borne by those in the industry but those consumers who bear the brunt of their tactics.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to be clear. Many things concern me about this legislation. We need to be very careful about this.

We have a situation here where this is clearly an effort to give Big Business an advantage. All the speakers on our side have talked to that. We can go around saying we don't need regulations, but regulations are very, very important. This President has done a lot with regard to addressing the issue of regulations.

There is something else that is happening here that really bothers me. There was a tremendous effort by the other side when we were trying to get the consumer financial protection bill passed.

After seeing our constituents abused over and over again, we bring about an agency that would bring them some type of protection, and here, we are taking away money from an agency that already needs money, the very agency that is there to help our constituents. That concerns me.

The other thing that concerns me is that we have an extra layer here. It makes it much more difficult now with regard to rulemaking, and then to have the courts have the ability to delay and basically take away rules is unprecedented. That is something that even Newt Gingrich didn't do.

We need to look at what we are doing and bring a sense of balance, and the other side will say that balance is brought about because private industry is given an opportunity to be involved in the process.

Well, they really do have a tremendous advantage because, as Ms. NORTON said, they are the ones that have the lawyers. They are the ones who have the big money. They are the ones now who will be able to come in before the regulations are even formulated and have their say while the public won't be in that kind of position.

Let's not kid ourselves. We are putting our constituents at a decided disadvantage, no matter how you look at it. This is a triumph for Big Business.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The one who is in the power position, the one who has got the resources, the one that has got the attorneys is the government. The government is the one that has got all the cards.

All we are asking for is to allow input from individuals, small businesses, big businesses. If you are going to be affected, isn't it common sense to suggest that maybe they should talk to the people that they are going to put this mandate on? Let's have a discussion, a dialogue, get some input from them?

The name of this bill is very, very accurate, Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. What are we afraid of, asking them the question: How are you going to be impacted? What is this going to do to the economy?

What I hear from my constituents—and I have heard it from outside of Utah's Third Congressional District—is the Federal Government comes in with its big, heavy hand, and they have no voice, no opportunity. It is just laid upon them.

I appreciate Dr. FOXX and what she is doing. We also hear from State, local, and tribal governments, from small businesses and business organizations that are in support of this bill.

In fiscal year 2014, the administration estimated the annual cost of major regulations was between $57 billion and $84 billion. There is room. There is appropriate use of regulations. To suggest that we are opposed to all regulations is irresponsible.

I think there are good regulations that are in place—they make our country better—but there needs to be a process and a communication and input from individuals that are affected by these regulations.

We have got to understand the costs and how we are passing these unfunded mandates on to State and local governments. This is an important part of the process.

Updating this law, we can ensure all parties, from government entities to small businesses to individuals, understand the true costs of the prospective mandates.

This bill should successfully pass in the House again, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I applaud Dr. FOXX from North Carolina, the prime sponsor of this, for moving this legislation.

I would urge, my colleagues, a ''yea'' vote on H.R. 50, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–4, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114–14, is adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 50

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is—

(1) to improve the quality of the deliberations of Congress with respect to proposed Federal mandates by—

(A) providing Congress and the public with more complete information about the effects of such mandates; and

(B) ensuring that Congress acts on such mandates only after focused deliberation on their effects; and

(2) to enhance the ability of Congress and the public to identify Federal mandates that may impose undue harm on consumers, workers, employers, small businesses, and State, local, and tribal governments.

SEC. 3. PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE STUDIES ON POLICIES INVOLVING CHANGES IN CONDITIONS OF GRANT AID.

Section 202(g) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 602(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ADDITIONAL STUDIES.—At the request of any Chairman or ranking member of the minority of a Committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives, the Director shall conduct an assessment comparing the authorized level of funding in a bill or resolution to the prospective costs of carrying out any changes to a condition of Federal assistance being imposed on State, local, or tribal governments participating in the Federal assistance program concerned or, in the case of a bill or joint resolution that authorizes such sums as are necessary, an assessment of an estimated level of funding compared to such costs.''.

SEC. 4. CLARIFYING THE DEFINITION OF DIRECT COSTS TO REFLECT CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PRACTICE.

Section 421(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658(3)(A)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting ''incur or'' before ''be required''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after ''to spend'' the following: ''or could forgo in profits, including costs passed on to consumers or other entities taking into account, to the extent practicable, behavioral changes,''.

SEC. 5. EXPANDING THE SCOPE OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO INCLUDE REGULATIONS IMPOSED BY INDEPENDENT REGULATORY AGENCIES.

Paragraph (1) of section 421 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658) is amended by striking '', but does not include independent regulatory agencies'' and inserting '', except it does not include the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee''.

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS TO REPLACE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET WITH OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4; 2 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 103(c) (2 U.S.C. 1511(c))—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET'' and inserting ''OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS''; and

(B) by striking ''Director of the Office of Management and Budget'' and inserting ''Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs'';

(2) in section 205(c) (2 U.S.C. 1535(c))—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''OMB''; and

(B) by striking ''Director of the Office of Management and Budget'' and inserting ''Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs''; and

(3) in section 206 (2 U.S.C. 1536), by striking ''Director of the Office of Management and Budget'' and inserting ''Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs''.

SEC. 7. APPLYING SUBSTANTIVE POINT OF ORDER TO PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATES.

Section 425(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658d(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Federal intergovernmental mandates'' and inserting ''Federal mandates''; and

(2) by inserting ''or 424(b)(1)'' after ''section 424(a)(1)''.

SEC. 8. REGULATORY PROCESS AND PRINCIPLES.

Section 201 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 201. REGULATORY PROCESS AND PRINCIPLES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall, unless otherwise expressly prohibited by law, assess the effects of Federal regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector (other than to the extent that such regulatory actions incorporate requirements specifically set forth in law) in accordance with the following principles:

''(1) Each agency shall identify the problem that it intends to address (including, if applicable, the failures of private markets or public institutions that warrant new agency action) as well as assess the significance of that problem.

''(2) Each agency shall examine whether existing regulations (or other law) have created, or contributed to, the problem that a new regulation is intended to correct and whether those regulations (or other law) should be modified to achieve the intended goal of regulation more effectively.

''(3) Each agency shall identify and assess available alternatives to direct regulation, including providing economic incentives to encourage the desired behavior, such as user fees or marketable permits, or providing information upon which choices can be made by the public.

''(4) If an agency determines that a regulation is the best available method of achieving the regulatory objective, it shall design its regulations in the most cost-effective manner to achieve the regulatory objective. In doing so, each agency shall consider incentives for innovation, consistency, predictability, the costs of enforcement and compliance (to the government, regulated entities, and the public), flexibility, distributive impacts, and equity.

''(5) Each agency shall assess both the costs and the benefits of the intended regulation and, recognizing that some costs and benefits are difficult to quantify, propose or adopt a regulation, unless expressly prohibited by law, only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs.

''(6) Each agency shall base its decisions on the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, and other information concerning the need for, and consequences of, the intended regulation.

''(7) Each agency shall identify and assess alternative forms of regulation and shall, to the extent feasible, specify performance objectives, rather than specifying the behavior or manner of compliance that regulated entities must adopt.

''(8) Each agency shall avoid regulations that are inconsistent, incompatible, or duplicative with its other regulations or those of other Federal agencies.

''(9) Each agency shall tailor its regulations to minimize the costs of the cumulative impact of regulations.

''(10) Each agency shall draft its regulations to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from such uncertainty.

''(b) REGULATORY ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'regulatory action' means any substantive action by an agency (normally published in the Federal Register) that promulgates or is expected to lead to the promulgation of a final rule or regulation, including advance notices of proposed rulemaking and notices of proposed rulemaking.''.

SEC. 9. EXPANDING THE SCOPE OF STATEMENTS TO ACCOMPANY SIGNIFICANT REGULATORY ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise expressly prohibited by law, before promulgating any general notice of proposed rulemaking or any final rule, or within six months after promulgating any final rule that was not preceded by a general notice of proposed rulemaking, if the proposed rulemaking or final rule includes a Federal mandate that may result in an annual effect on State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, in the aggregate of $100,000,000 or more in any 1 year, the agency shall prepare a written statement containing the following:

''(1) The text of the draft proposed rulemaking or final rule, together with a reasonably detailed description of the need for the proposed rulemaking or final rule and an explanation of how the proposed rulemaking or final rule will meet that need.

''(2) An assessment of the potential costs and benefits of the proposed rulemaking or final rule, including an explanation of the manner in which the proposed rulemaking or final rule is consistent with a statutory requirement and avoids undue interference with State, local, and tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions.

''(3) A qualitative and quantitative assessment, including the underlying analysis, of benefits anticipated from the proposed rulemaking or final rule (such as the promotion of the efficient functioning of the economy and private markets, the enhancement of health and safety, the protection of the natural environment, and the elimination or reduction of discrimination or bias).

''(4) A qualitative and quantitative assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs anticipated from the proposed rulemaking or final rule (such as the direct costs both to the Government in administering the final rule and to businesses and others in complying with the final rule, and any adverse effects on the efficient functioning of the economy, private markets (including productivity, employment, and international competitiveness), health, safety, and the natural environment).

''(5) Estimates by the agency, if and to the extent that the agency determines that accurate estimates are reasonably feasible, of—

''(A) the future compliance costs of the Federal mandate; and

''(B) any disproportionate budgetary effects of the Federal mandate upon any particular regions of the Nation or particular State, local, or tribal governments, urban or rural or other types of communities, or particular segments of the private sector.

''(6)(A) A detailed description of the extent of the agency's prior consultation with the private sector and elected representatives (under section 204) of the affected State, local, and tribal governments.

''(B) A detailed summary of the comments and concerns that were presented by the private sector and State, local, or tribal governments either orally or in writing to the agency.

''(C) A detailed summary of the agency's evaluation of those comments and concerns.

''(7) A detailed summary of how the agency complied with each of the regulatory principles described in section 201.''.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR DETAILED SUMMARY.—Subsection (b) of section 202 of such Act is amended by inserting ''detailed'' before ''summary''.

SEC. 10. ENHANCED STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION.

Section 204 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1534) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND PRIVATE SECTOR**'' before ''**INPUT**'';*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting '', and impacted parties within the private sector (including small business),'' after ''on their behalf)''; and

(B) by striking ''Federal intergovernmental mandates'' and inserting ''Federal mandates''; and

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) GUIDELINES.—For appropriate implementation of subsections (a) and (b) consistent with applicable laws and regulations, the following guidelines shall be followed:

''(1) Consultations shall take place as early as possible, before issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking, continue through the final rule stage, and be integrated explicitly into the rulemaking process.

''(2) Agencies shall consult with a wide variety of State, local, and tribal officials and impacted parties within the private sector (including small businesses). Geographic, political, and other factors that may differentiate varying points of view should be considered.

''(3) Agencies should estimate benefits and costs to assist with these consultations. The scope of the consultation should reflect the cost and significance of the Federal mandate being considered.

''(4) Agencies shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) seek out the views of State, local, and tribal governments, and impacted parties within the private sector (including small business), on costs, benefits, and risks; and

''(B) solicit ideas about alternative methods of compliance and potential flexibilities, and input on whether the Federal regulation will harmonize with and not duplicate similar laws in other levels of government.

''(5) Consultations shall address the cumulative impact of regulations on the affected entities.

''(6) Agencies may accept electronic submissions of comments by relevant parties but may not use those comments as the sole method of satisfying the guidelines in this subsection.''.

SEC. 11. NEW AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.

Section 208 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1538) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 208. OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS RESPONSIBILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall provide meaningful guidance and oversight so that each agency's regulations for which a written statement is required under section 202 are consistent with the principles and requirements of this title, as well as other applicable laws, and do not conflict with the policies or actions of another agency. If the Administrator determines that an agency's regulations for which a written statement is required under section 202 do not comply with such principles and requirements, are not consistent with other applicable laws, or conflict with the policies or actions of another agency, the Administrator shall identify areas of non-compliance, notify the agency, and request that the agency comply before the agency finalizes the regulation concerned.

''(b) ANNUAL STATEMENTS TO CONGRESS ON AGENCY COMPLIANCE.—The Director of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs annually shall submit to Congress, including the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, a written report detailing compliance by each agency with the requirements of this title that relate to regulations for which a written statement is required by section 202, including activities undertaken at the request of the Director to improve compliance, during the preceding reporting period. The report shall also contain an appendix detailing compliance by each agency with section 204.''.

SEC. 12. RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS OF EXISTING FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4; 2 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 209 as section 210; and

(2) by inserting after section 208 the following new section 209:

''SEC. 209. RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS OF EXISTING FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—At the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of a standing or select committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate, an agency shall conduct a retrospective analysis of an existing Federal regulation promulgated by an agency.

''(b) REPORT.—Each agency conducting a retrospective analysis of existing Federal regulations pursuant to subsection (a) shall submit to the chairman of the relevant committee, Congress, and the Comptroller General a report containing, with respect to each Federal regulation covered by the analysis—

''(1) a copy of the Federal regulation;

''(2) the continued need for the Federal regulation;

''(3) the nature of comments or complaints received concerning the Federal regulation from the public since the Federal regulation was promulgated;

''(4) the extent to which the Federal regulation overlaps, duplicates, or conflicts with other Federal regulations, and, to the extent feasible, with State and local governmental rules;

''(5) the degree to which technology, economic conditions, or other factors have changed in the area affected by the Federal regulation;

''(6) a complete analysis of the retrospective direct costs and benefits of the Federal regulation that considers studies done outside the Federal Government (if any) estimating such costs or benefits; and

''(7) any litigation history challenging the Federal regulation.''.

SEC. 13. EXPANSION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Section 401(a) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1571(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2)(A)—

(A) by striking ''sections 202 and 203(a)(1) and (2)'' each place it appears and inserting ''sections 201, 202, 203(a)(1) and (2), and 205(a) and (b)''; and

(B) by striking ''only'' each place it appears;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''section 202'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''section 202, prepare the written plan under section 203(a)(1) and (2), or comply with section 205(a) and (b), a court may compel the agency to prepare such written statement, prepare such written plan, or comply with such section.''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''written statement or plan is required'' and all that follows through ''shall not'' and inserting the following: ''written statement under section 202, a written plan under section 203(a)(1) and (2), or compliance with sections 201 and 205(a) and (b) is required, the inadequacy or failure to prepare such statement (including the inadequacy or failure to prepare any estimate, analysis, statement, or description), to prepare such written plan, or to comply with such section may''.

SEC. 14. BUREAU FUNDING AUTHORITY.

The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection may not request, under section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, during fiscal year 2016 an amount that would result in the total amount requested by the Director during that fiscal year to exceed $550,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. REED

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 114–14.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 1, insert ''private property owners,'' after ''small businesses,''.

Page 10, line 24, strike the closing quotation marks and second period.

Page 10, after line 24, add the following:

''(8) An assessment of the effects that the proposed rulemaking or final rule are expected to have on private property owners, including the use and value of affected property.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, private property rights are fundamental to our liberties and freedom as American citizens. These rights are recognized in the Fifth Amendment to our United States Constitution.

The overreaching actions from government on all levels—in particular here, today, the Federal Government and its agencies—is infringing on these rights by limiting property use and impacting property values. This is not right, and we must address this issue.

My amendment is simple, and it is fair. The amendment will require agencies to assess the impact of their governmental actions on private property, including the use and value of that private property.

Mr. Chairman, this will ensure fairness and transparency. Agencies will have to recognize the effects their government action will have on private property once this amendment is approved.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard from constituents in my district and from across America that this government needs to be held in check and, in particular, when it comes to our fundamental freedoms such as private property rights.

At this point in time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah, Chairman CHAFFETZ, chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Congressman REED and what he is trying to do here. I think this makes a lot of sense.

His amendment asks agencies to consider the effects of regulatory action upon private property owners. The amendment furthers the bill's intent to

provide more input from private sector entities and taxpayers affected by these regulations. It thinks of farms and other types of public land issues that we deal with, particularly out West, but across the Nation.

Federal regulators should consider the effects of any regulation on private property owners.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to really oppose this amendment. This amendment would add a requirement that agencies evaluate the impacts of a rule on private property owners. I do not object to this requirement in isolation.

The problem is that this amendment adds one more requirement to the layers of red tape this bill already adds to the rulemaking process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman for their lack of opposition in support of this amendment.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just say, as we care about American citizens across the country, we must stand with them, and we must support their fundamental freedoms that are represented in our Constitution, and that is what this amendment will do.

It is a simple, concise amendment that will just recognize that the government, once and for all, must recognize that it is impacting private property rights in America with its actions and quantify that impact when it comes to the use and value of their private property.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 114–14.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 12.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes section 12 of the bill.

Section 12 would require an agency to perform a retrospective analysis of any existing rule any time a committee chairman or ranking member asked for it.

Under this section, any one of nearly 100 Members of Congress could tie an agency up in knots, forcing review after review of any existing rule.

I asked the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service to analyze the constitutionality of this section. CRS provided my staff with a memo that found that section 12 of H.R. 50 raises a serious constitutional question.

CRS evaluated the impact of the Supreme Court's decision in INS v. Chadha. In that case, the Court held that Congress can exercise its legislative authority only through bicameral passage of legislation that is then presented to the President.

CRS evaluated whether giving individual Members of Congress the authority to demand agency action would violate that requirement.

Here is what CRS found: ''It could be argued that imbuing certain Members with the authority to demand that an agency prepare a report under section 12 is an action of sufficient legislative character and effect as to trigger the bicameralism and presentment requirements of article I.''

CRS also found there is a ''tenable argument that the provisions of section 12 raise constitutional concerns of the magnitude addressed in Chadha.''

Congress certainly has a legitimate interest in conducting oversight of agency actions. It is appropriate for House committees to request information about agency rules and how they can be improved, but committees already have the opportunity to conduct that type of oversight.

We don't need to require in legislation that an agency conduct an entirely new cost-benefit analysis for potentially every rule on the books at the whim of individual Members of Congress. CRS notes that Congress could conduct these reviews as part of its oversight prerogative.

CRS goes on to note, however, that if these reviews were considered part of congressional oversight rather than an exercise of legislative authority, they ''would leave open significant and unresolved questions regarding the parameters of congressional oversight authority.'' These questions are significant enough to warrant stripping this section from the bill.

In addition, section 12 would threaten the ability of agencies to carry out their missions. The more time an agency spends responding to demands for rule reviews, the less time it is spending performing the work it is supposed to be doing.

□ 1500

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, a cost-benefit analysis prior to the implementation of a regulation requires a number of assumptions that make an accurate analysis difficult, if not impossible.

H.R. 50 allows committee chairmen and ranking members to ask for the retrospective reviews of specific regulations.

I think there needs to be a degree of deference and some respect for the idea that it is for committee chairmen and ranking members, both sides of the aisle, not just based on some whim. I think it is offensive to suggest that it be just some whimsical thing.

This allows an important check on any pre-implementation cost-benefit analysis, and these retrospective reviews better clarify the true costs of regulation. Even President Obama supports retrospective reviews and issued an executive order requiring agencies to conduct them.

More importantly, retrospective reviews work. In April of 2014, the GAO issued a report on retrospective reviews at 22 executive agencies. That report found that more than 90 percent of retrospective regulation reviews led the agencies to revise, clarify, or eliminate regulation text—90 percent.

However, the pace of retrospective review is much slower than planned, and the 22 agencies reviewed by the GAO had plans to conduct more than 650 retrospective reviews but had only completed 246 of them as of August of 2013.

As you can see, the agencies are already doing this work. It is good to go back and review. We shouldn't be afraid of that. We should encourage it.

This provision in the bill simply allows Congress to work with agencies to prioritize regulatory areas most important to the American taxpayer. We need to maintain the ability to make such requests, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have on this side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I think we do have something to be concerned about with this provision of the bill, and I rise enthusiastically to support Mr. CUMMINGS' amendment. He has raised serious issues about the constitutional nature of this provision which could take down the whole bill.

I was working in the United States Senate at the time of the Chadha rendering by the Supreme Court, and it is crystal clear. It is crystal clear to me that this retrospective provision, empowering Congress, tantamount to a

legislative veto, though we don't call it that, is an encroachment on executive authority, and will be so found by courts.

Therefore, I think it is prudent for this body to adopt the Cummings amendment and clear that constitutional cloud that hangs over H.R. 50.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, that is some good creative thinking right there. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the things that we have to keep in mind, the President is the President. You are talking about 100 Members of Congress, as opposed to the President. The President has done this, and the chairman admits that they are already behind.

So now what we are going to do is bring in a whole new 100 people, at a whim, to say, We don't like something and let's pull it back.

No. I think we are better than that, and I think it does have constitutional problems. I think enough is being done, and I am glad to hear somebody giving the President some credit for something. The fact is that he has been most aggressive in this area.

I don't think that this provision is needed, and I would urge Members to vote in favor of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to highlight, again, that when there was a report done by the GAO, they found that 90 percent of retrospective regulation reviews led agencies to revise, clarify, or eliminate regulatory text.

All this does is ask for a report. It doesn't repeal it. It is not going to slow it down. What it does is ask for a report. That is an important process to go through, and when we have gone through it in the past, 90 percent of the time, according to the GAO, it has led to revisions that are important.

It is very difficult to understand what is going to happen on the front end. All we are asking for in this bill is let's consult with the individuals, the property owners, others who are affected, and then, if we need a report, and we are going to limit that to chairmen and ranking members, that is an appropriate thing to do.

What are we afraid of? We are just trying to get transparency to the issue and be able to highlight this.

I worry, when you talk about the numbers of reviews and how far behind, it just shows the massive numbers of regulations that go through this process. We should be able to review those. There are real Americans that are affected by this every day.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 114–14.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 14. SUNSET OF UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT AMENDMENTS IF GDP GROWTH FAILS TO INCREASE AT AVERAGE ANNUAL RATE OF 5 PERCENT OR MORE.

(a) SUNSET.—If the real gross domestic product of the United States fails to increase at an average annual rate of 5 percent or more for the first 4 calendar quarters occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act, as determined under subsection (b), then the amendments made by this Act to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4; 2 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.) and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 602 et seq.) are repealed.

(b) DETERMINATION OF GROWTH OF GDP.—For purposes of subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) calculate the average annual rate of growth of the real gross domestic product for the first 4 calendar quarters occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) submit to Congress a report containing such calculation and such other information as the Director considers appropriate, not later than 30 days after the end of the 4th calendar quarter occurring after such date of enactment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this simple, clear amendment to H.R. 50. This amendment seeks to establish a performance-based sunset mechanism stipulating that, in the event that the average annual rate of real GDP growth remains below 5 percent over the first 4 quarters occurring after the date of enactment, then the statutory changes made by H.R. 50 are repealed because the bill will have been proved to have been ineffective.

This amendment sets up a real world measurement and a sunset mechanism that supporters and opponents, it seems to me, can support, since it features the flexibility to ensure an optimal response to whichever prediction of the impact of H.R. 50, positive or negative, takes place over the year following enactment.

If the Unfunded Mandates Act, by lessening the independence of independent regulatory agencies and strengthening the influence of the private sector in the Federal rulemaking process, does, in fact, spur the economic growth we have heard so much about to at least match the average annual real GDP growth rates achieved during two administrations, the Johnson and Kennedy administrations, and in the last 2 quarters of this administration so far, what is the threat?

What are we afraid of?

However, if it fails to spur the promised economic growth to at least achieve an average annual growth rate of 5 percent over the year following the enactment of the law, then the statutory changes made by H.R. 50 will be repealed.

Five percent is reasonable. It is a reasonable target goal when one considers that, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, real GDP growth under the Obama economy reached 4.6 percent in the second quarter and 5 percent in the fourth.

Why wouldn't we expect H.R. 50 to be able to sustain that growth rate and, indeed, improve on it in the first full year after enactment?

Finally, I would note that, according to the preliminary estimate of the Congressional Budget Office, this amendment would not increase direct spending or reduce revenues, and I strongly urge all of the Members in the body to adopt this commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate my colleague from Virginia. I appreciate his tenacity and good work on these issues and on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

But I do have to suggest that if the economy is struggling, Federal regulators should be extra concerned about imposing undue and unnecessary costs on to the American public and the private sector job creators.

H.R. 50 helps ensure that regulations that impose unfunded mandates on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector are fully analyzed and considered.

Keep in mind, we are focused here on unfunded mandates. This amendment would repeal this helpful legislation if the GDP rate grows at a rate of less than 5 percent. To me, this is counterproductive.

GDP is a deliberately broad measure of economic growth. The GDP does not reflect the impact a regulatory mandate might have on a State or local government or a portion of the private sector, nor does it reflect the impact of regulations as a whole.

Ultimately, GDP growth is not a substitute for a sensible regulatory analysis and process. I would argue that,

regardless of GDP growth or reduction, we need to allow, particularly these local governments, these tribal governments, these private individuals—it is the little guy that has this unfunded mandate thrust upon them that we have to review.

So repealing H.R. 50 if the GDP is failing to grow is contrary to the very purpose of this bill and, therefore, I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would inquire of the Chair how much time remains on this side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say in response to my friend from Utah, also a neat argument. All of a sudden we are now retreating from the economic rationale for moving beyond unfunded mandates, for getting the hobnail-booted government off the necks of business so jobs can grow and the economy can just take off. Now, that is not really the purpose of this. It is transparency and getting unfunded mandates exposed. I think that is a fairly weak argument and justification for a bad bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this commonsense amendment. The legislation we are considering today has been sold by supporters as a jobs bill. Give me a break.

This amendment simply says that if the economy doesn't improve the way the bill's supporters say it will, then the bill will sunset. It is as simple as that. The amendment would leave the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act untouched. This sunset provision would only impact the changes made by this bill. For those reasons, I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. In summary, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a commonsense amendment. I think it sets a metric that I would hope my friends on the other side of the aisle would actually embrace so that we can see whether a new piece of legislation is, in fact, working. It would allow the bill to go into place for a whole year before that metric kicks in. I think it is a commonsense amendment that actually gives us a chance to see whether the philosophy undergirding this legislation is, indeed, justified.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chair, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, to take a metric of the gross domestic product, the entire economy, and then have that be the weighted factor by what may happen to a dairy farmer, for instance, who is out there in Utah or Kansas or Colorado is not the way that we should be determining whether or not H.R. 50 is in place.

If the economy is waning, if the economy is decreasing, if our production overall for our Nation is declining, that may be the very key indicator that we have thrust too many unfunded mandates upon the little guy, the dairy farmer, the person who has got a transmission shop. It could be a whole host of things. It may be upon private property owners. It could be—you name it.

Pretty much in this country, there are mandates that are thrust upon people, and they feel like they have no ability, no understanding why this happens. They don't feel like they have a voice in the process.

So I stand in opposition to this amendment. So, to the overall gross economy, to say that we are just going to repeal that, H.R. 50, and get rid of our ability to ask people to consult, ask the government agencies to consult with local governments, to consult with private individuals, to talk to small businesses, we are going to just get rid of that because the economy is waning?

□ 1515

I would argue that part of the reason our economy hasn't taken off is there are too many unfunded mandates. The government imposes these, and they don't have a full understanding of what is causing these people to not hire more people, to invest more capital.

So I stand in opposition to this. I appreciate the gentleman who offered it, but I stand in opposition to this amendment. I would urge my colleagues a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 114–14 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 245, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Chu (CA)
Duckworth
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

□ 1543

Messrs. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, TURNER, HUELSKAMP, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. CLYBURN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

Babin
Chu (CA)
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1548

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chair, on roll call no. 62, Connolly Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted No.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 78, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. BUSTOS. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Bustos moves to recommit the bill H.R. 50 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 14. STOPPING SEXUAL PREDATORS, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND RAPE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply to, limit, or restrict any Federal agency mandate or action the purpose of which is to—

(1) protect students and children from a person who has been convicted in any court of a sex offense against a minor;

(2) prevent domestic violence by stopping persons from harassing, stalking, or threatening a spouse, family member, an intimate partner, or the child of an intimate partner;

(3) prevent rape or sexual assault; or

(4) require criminal background checks for school or other employees through a search of the National Crime Information Center, the FBI's Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System, or the National Sex Offender Public Website.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay or kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage as amended.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, preserves critical protections against sexual and domestic violence. We must not be so eager to eliminate regulations that we remove important protections that keep our communities, our children, and our families safe from harm.

The underlying bill would essentially stop or bog down all regulation. My amendment would provide exemptions from the bill so there is no interruption in efforts to prevent sexual and domestic violence.

This includes protecting children from convicted sex offenders and preventing domestic violence, including stalking. It also addresses rape and sexual assault and using Federal resources for background checks for school employees.

On a personal note, before I came to Congress, I worked as an investigative news reporter, and my husband has spent his entire 30-year career in law enforcement and now serves as sheriff of Rock Island County, Illinois. Between the two of us, we have come across far too many disturbing and real-life stories of sexual and domestic violence.

I will always remember a case that I covered involving a little boy named Jerry Nelson. He was a small, defenseless child who was murdered in Henry County, Illinois, which is now in the congressional district that I serve. I am going to repeat that last line because if you didn't hear it, I hope you will take a listen here because this is what we are talking about in this amendment.

When I was a news reporter, a case I remember most involved a 3-year-old child named Jerry Nelson. He was small. He was defenseless. He lived in an area called Henry County, Illinois, which is now the central part of the congressional district I serve.

He was beaten. He was abused. He was terribly battered by his mother's boyfriend, and this happened across the Mississippi River where I live but in the State of Iowa.

When Jerry's family moved across the Mississippi River into the State of Illinois, Iowa did not share its case file—despite having investigated this—with the Illinois authorities, and they were not require to do so.

There was no mechanism in place for sharing the information. Jerry's abuser would eventually sexually molest him and then murder him when he was just 3 years old. At that time, why this was so emotional for me is because he was the exact same age as my youngest child who today is 24 years old.

When doctors examined little Jerry Nelson's body, they found more than 20 bruises, a broken clavicle, and brain injuries consistent with falling from a three-story building onto concrete.

My commonsense amendment that I am telling you about right now would help prevent more children like Jerry from becoming victims of heinous crimes and unimaginable trauma. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the body, thank the Speaker, and the process by which we did this. This bill came up in regular order in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. We had a full and complete markup. That was followed by going to the Rules Committee.

Every single amendment that was offered at the Rules Committee was made in order, two Democrat amendments as well as the Republican amendment. We had good and lively debate about those, and we just voted on those amendments. I appreciate that.

From my heart, I will tell you that I look forward to working with the gentlewoman from Illinois and everybody else in this body to attack and go after—defend the innocent and make sure that we attack domestic violence because it is so prevalent in every aspect of our society, but I would suggest to you that this is the wrong amendment.

What this does, it does not force the Federal Government to actually work with the individuals that are affected. What H.R. 50 does, what this bill does is to make sure that the Federal Government consults with individuals, it consults with small businesses, those that are affected by mandates.

I want the Federal Government—in fact, I would love to codify the idea that the Federal Government in this case and what you offer in the motion shouldn't talk to these people, they should talk to them. We want them to talk to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. They should be the first people that they call. If you want to know what is happening in this country, go talk to the individuals who are affected by this.

What this legislation, H.R. 50, does is to make sure that individuals are asked before; it makes sure that nothing is repealed. We don't get to unilaterally repeal things. I heard the word ''repeal.''

No, there are reports that we need to access and look at, and so if we truly want to get after domestic violence and these heinous crimes—these awful, hideous crimes—then you want to vote in favor of H.R. 50 and make sure that the Federal Government does go and consult with the victims of crime.

I oppose this motion to recommit and vote in favor of H.R. 50 by Dr. FOXX.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 239, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Chu (CA)
Duckworth
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Schock
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1606

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. LOWEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE AND PRAYER FOR THE VALHALLA, NEW YORK, COMMUTER TRAIN ACCIDENT VICTIMS, THEIR FAMILIES, AND THE COMMUNITY

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, a commuter train struck an automobile at a grade crossing in Valhalla, New York, resulting in the deaths of six people and many others injured.

I stand on the House floor today with my colleagues to call for a moment of silence to honor those who lost their lives in this tragic accident and offer sincere condolences to the families of the victims, pray for the full recovery of those injured, and thank our first responders for quickly arriving at the scene to help others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 173, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—250

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce

Perry	Russell	Trott
Peterson	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Pittenger	Salmon	Upton
Pitts	Sanchez, Loretta	Valadao
Poe (TX)	Sanford	Wagner
Poliquin	Scalise	Walberg
Pompeo	Schock	Walden
Posey	Schrader	Walker
Price (GA)	Schweikert	Walorski
Ratcliffe	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Reichert	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Renacci	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Ribble	Shuster	Westerman
Rice (SC)	Simpson	Westmoreland
Rigell	Sinema	Whitfield
Roby	Smith (MO)	Williams
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Womack
Rokita	Stefanik	Woodall
Rooney (FL)	Stewart	Yoder
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Yoho
Roskam	Stutzman	Young (IA)
Ross	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Rothfus	Thornberry	Zeldin
Rouzer	Tiberi	Zinke
Royce	Tipton	

NOES—173

Adams	Grayson	Norcross
Aguilar	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bass	Green, Gene	Pallone
Beatty	Grijalva	Pascrell
Becerra	Hahn	Payne
Bera	Hastings	Pelosi
Beyer	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters
Blumenauer	Himes	Pingree
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Pocan
Boyle (PA)	Honda	Polis
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Rangel
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Richmond
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Carney	Keating	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kind	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Scott, David
Clay	Langevin	Serrano
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cohen	Lawrence	Sires
Connolly	Levin	Slaughter
Cooper	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lieu (CA)	Speier
Crowley	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Loebsack	Takai
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Titus
DeLauro	Lynch	Tonko
DelBene	Maloney, Carolyn	Torres
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Deutch	Matsui	Van Hollen
Dingell	McCollum	Vargas
Doggett	McDermott	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	McGovern	Vela
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Visclosky
Engel	Meng	Walz
Eshoo	Moore	Wasserman Schultz
Esty	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Nadler	Welch
Foster	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Neal	Yarmuth
Fudge	Nolan	
Gabbard		
Gallego		
Garamendi		

NOT VOTING—10

Chu (CA)	Lee	Roe (TN)
Conyers	Lofgren	Young (AK)
Duckworth	Murphy (PA)	
Gutiérrez	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1615

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 64 had I been present, I would have voted aye.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently did not vote during Roll Call #64 on passage of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015. Had I voted, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Wednesday, February 4, 2015.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll call vote 59, and "nay" on roll call vote 60.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll call vote 61, "yea" on roll call vote 62, and "yea" on roll call vote 63.

I would have voted "nay" on roll call vote 64 in strong opposition to H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Rollcall #59—YEA
Rollcall #60—AYE
Rollcall #61—NO
Rollcall #62—NO
Rollcall #63—NO
Rollcall #64—AYE

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 279

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from H.R. 279, to amend the Communications Act of 1934.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CLAY HUNT SAV ACT WILL SAVE VETERANS' LIVES

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, those who sign up to serve and defend our country deserve our respect and support when they return home. Sadly, there is a crisis in our country when it comes to our veterans' health care. With an average of 22 veterans a day taking their own lives, we are failing them.

That is why Congress took action to pass the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act so as to improve mental health care services and suicide prevention programs at the VA and at the Department of Defense. By establishing pilot programs to recruit and keep psychiatrists and to establish support networks for veterans, the Clay Hunt SAV Act will help servicemembers transition to life after the military. The bill is named after Clay Hunt, a brave soldier who served in both Iraq and Afghanistan. Tragically, Clay took his own life when he returned home.

I want to thank my Minnesota colleague, TIM WALZ, for his leadership on this issue, and I encourage the President to quickly sign this legislation into law and get our veterans the support that they deserve.

THE PASSING OF CHARLIE SIFFORD

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note the passing of a great American.

Golf pioneer Charlie Sifford died last night at the age of 92. Often called the ''Jackie Robinson of golf,'' Sifford wrote in his autobiography, ''Just Let Me Play,'' about his fateful meeting with the man who broke baseball's color barrier:

''He asked me if I was a quitter,'' Sifford wrote.

''I told him: 'No.' ''

''He said: 'If you're not a quitter, you're probably going to experience some things that will make you want to quit.' ''

Sifford experienced unspeakable acts of racial abuse, slurs, and threats as he became the first African American to play the PGA Tour.

Born in Charlotte, North Carolina, in 1922, Sifford worked as a caddie and dominated the all-Black United States Golfers Association, winning five straight national titles. He challenged the PGA's Whites-only rule, and, in 1961, they rescinded it. Sifford won the Greater Hartford Open in 1967 and the Los Angeles Open in 1969. He also won the 1975 Senior PGA Championship. In 2004, he became the first African American inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame.

Last year, President Barack Obama awarded Sifford the Medal of Freedom, joining Jack Nicklaus and Arnold Palmer as the only golfers to receive our Nation's highest civilian honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 239, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Bass
Chu (CA)
Duckworth
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Schock
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1606

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. LOWEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE AND PRAYER FOR THE VALHALLA, NEW YORK, COMMUTER TRAIN ACCIDENT VICTIMS, THEIR FAMILIES, AND THE COMMUNITY

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, a commuter train struck an automobile at a grade crossing in Valhalla, New York, resulting in the deaths of six people and many others injured.

I stand on the House floor today with my colleagues to call for a moment of silence to honor those who lost their lives in this tragic accident and offer sincere condolences to the families of the victims, pray for the full recovery of those injured, and thank our first responders for quickly arriving at the scene to help others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 173, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—250

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce

Tiger Woods, one of the greatest golfers of all time, has often said he may have never taken up the game were it not for the courage, grace, and perseverance of Charlie Sifford.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie Sifford was not a quitter. He was a hero. He was my hero. May he rest in peace.

WORLD CANCER DAY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today is World Cancer Day, a day to recognize the patients, survivors, caregivers, and those who raise awareness on their behalf. Cancer has touched every family and community in some way, and it is their stories that sustain the fight for increased funding for medical research.

According to the World Health Organization, cancer has caused over 8.2 million deaths worldwide. By the end of 2015, more than 1.5 million new cases will have been diagnosed within the United States.

Investing in medical research leads to advanced treatments and cures and has the potential to lower these devastating outcomes. It boosts the economy through job creation and new discoveries, and it allows America to maintain its position as a global leader in the fight for a cure. Yet, in the last decade, funding to the National Institutes of Health has been cut by nearly 25 percent. This is unacceptable. Last week, I reintroduced the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act with Representatives ROSA DELAURO and PETER KING. It is a bill that invests in the fight against horrible disease.

While today we recognize World Cancer Day, the goal must be to celebrate the day when we have a world without cancer.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a) and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mrs. MALONEY, New York

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–6)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2015.

The Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make significant progress in promotion of democratic, social, and economic development. The United States also supports the advancement of impartial justice in Côte d'Ivoire as well as the Government of Côte d'Ivoire's efforts to prepare for a peaceful, fair, and transparent presidential election in 2015, which will be an important milestone in Côte d'Ivoire's progress. We urge all sides to work for the benefit of the country as a whole by rejecting violence and participating in the electoral process.

While the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make progress toward peace and prosperity, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 2015.*

A CALL TO ACTION—BORDER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the opportunity today to spend some time with my colleagues to highlight an urgent and important issue that, quite frankly, should unite this body in a call to action.

I represent Arizona's Second Congressional District, and that includes 80 miles of the southern border. Today, we are going to be talking about the importance of securing our border both in the south and in the north. My colleague here from New York will be speaking on that matter. We do have Chairman MCCAUL here who will be joining us, but I have just a couple of lead-in comments.

I have spent a lot of time down at the border with our border residents and ranchers, and I can tell you the border is not secure. These people are daily taking risks for their families, for their livelihoods. This is a public safety risk, and this is a potential national security risk. Although some efforts have been taken, our border is not secure. We now have the opportunity to have a call to action to take the measures that are important in order to secure the border once and for all, which is impacting, again, the residents of my community.

I am grateful that a bipartisan group of Members of Congress came down to visit our southern border just 10 days ago. We had 20 Members, plus myself, so they could see firsthand what our ranchers and border residents are dealing with in Arizona. The group, under the leadership of Chairman MCCAUL, whom I will ask to join us here in a minute, visited the San Diego sector, then came to our Tucson sector, and then moved on to also see the challenges in Texas. We got to see firsthand what is going on in each of these different sectors and to reinforce the fact that this is an urgent matter that we have to address. It should be a bipartisan and uniting issue.

I have got lots of stories to share from the Tucson sector, but I have a number of colleagues who want to join in the conversation. I will first ask Chairman MCCAUL if he would like to join the discussion.

Mr. MCCAUL. Let me thank my colleague from Arizona for her great leadership. I think this House is well served to have the first female pilot who has served in combat.

We thank you for your service, and I can probably tell a few more stories of bravery about you. I am very fortunate to have you on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of grave importance to the Nation. As chairman of Homeland Security, when I go home, it is the number one issue, and the number one question I get back home is: Mr. Chairman, when are you going to secure that border?

I believe we have an opportunity in this Congress to finally get this thing done and to get it done in the right way and the smart way. People say: Why is it so important? In 10 years in the Congress and as a Federal prosecutor prior to that in dealing with this issue, I have seen the scourge of drug cartels, of human trafficking, the poisoning of our kids with drugs, and the potential threat of a terrorist attack in the United States. I don't want that on this Congress' head. We do have an opportunity to act. We have a bill that was passed out of committee, and I think it does several things.

One, it finally directs and tells the Department of Homeland Security how to get this mission done sector by sector. As the gentlewoman knows, Arizona is very different from San Diego and is very different from Texas, which is where we saw 60,000 children crossing last summer. We know that a surge is probably on its way again if we don't

act in this Congress soon. We also know, with the spread of ISIS overseas, that the threat is real.

With the event of the Jordanian's being lit on fire yesterday, it is a wake-up call that we need to act and that we need to act soon in the Congress to protect the American people. This is more than Homeland Security—it is national security. It is really not an immigration issue. This bill is about securing the border in a smart way.

When I was in Afghanistan and Pakistan, I met with General Allen. They didn't really have much of a fence, but I said: ''What is your border security with the Pak border?'' They pointed to aerostats in the sky that could see for hundreds of miles that we saw on our recent trip down there. With the value of 100 percent visibility to see what is coming in and how to stop it, you can measure success, first of all, but you can respond to the threats in realtime.

□ 1630

In addition, the VADER technology, the radar on the Predator UAVs, is of tremendous value for a smart border. A lot of these assets were actually used in Afghanistan. We have already paid for these assets, and we want to redeploy those to the southwest border.

We also fully fund the National Guard, which to our Governors—particularly my Governor in the great State of Texas—is of vital interest and concern. We allow access to Federal lands for CBP, which, in the past, they have been denied; and we have a U.S. exit system set up—which the 9/11 Commission recommended, and to this day Congress has failed to act on that—to determine who is staying with visas legally and who is overstaying those visas like we saw with the hijackers on 9/11.

At the end of the day, this is an important issue that has to get done. It is no longer time for lipservice; it is time for action on what I consider to be one of the most important Homeland Security issues facing this Nation.

I just want to thank the gentlelady for holding this Special Order. I know we have members of the committee here who have great expertise, both Federal prosecutors, CIA, and other experiences to bring this issue to life. I hope we can do more of this in the future.

The American people know this is an important issue. The problem is the Members of Congress have been tone deaf on this and have not gotten the job done. I would argue to my colleagues who are listening to this and to the American people that now is the time to finally get the job done.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate your leadership on this issue. I also want to thank you for coming to southern Arizona to my district to see firsthand what our border residents and ranchers are dealing with on a daily basis. I look forward to working with you on the committee to get this bill across the finish line and getting the strategy and the resources to those in the Border Patrol so that they can actually address the threat.

Mr. MCCAUL. If the gentlelady would just yield on this point, too, this is a bill not built from bureaucrats in Washington, down. This is a bill designed by talking to Border Patrol agents, to the border sheriffs who support this bill, to the ranchers. What a great presentation we received from John Ladd and his father, Jack, in Arizona.

I will never forget, when you had the press conference, John Ladd was saying: You know, for the first time, I have real hope.

They said: Well, Members have come down here before.

He said: Not this many and not of this caliber of leadership, and for the first time I have hope.

I don't want to let those ranchers down. I want to get this job done for the ranchers, the border sheriffs, and the agents who spend day in and day out in very tough conditions.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Would my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) want to join the conversation?

Mr. PERRY. Absolutely.

I want to also extend my appreciation to you for bringing up this important issue. I think this is going to kind of be a continuing conversation, at least for the next couple weeks, as we move forward into bringing this particular bill and the legislation to the floor.

With that, I was just thinking that in the last couple days I saw the President on TV, and he asked a question: What kind of country do we want to be?

I think you can think of that in a lot of different ways, but regarding the border, the President, while he says that, has preached over the years that he has made our Nation's border more secure than ever. I just remember last year when he was literally saying that, we saw tens of thousands of unaccompanied people coming across the border, and all of America was saying to themselves: What are you talking about? How can you say that?

The Border Patrol wasn't stopping these people. They were greeting these people and bringing them into the country. You are thinking, maybe that is a great thing, but we don't know who they are or what their intentions are, and you have no credibility, Mr. President, when you say that.

His statement is just supported by bloated statistics and a false sense of reality. I think most Americans understand that. As a matter of fact, the GAO recently found that only 44 percent of the southwest border was under operational control—44 percent. So 56 is just wide open apparently. Listen, that 44 percent, that is based on some best guess or some estimate because, believe it or not, they don't even keep the records.

Now, you know—you know as sure as you are watching this on TV or in the gallery or sitting at home thinking about it—that those Border Patrol agents and those sheriffs are keeping records of the things they do on a daily basis and a nightly basis, drove so many miles, picked up this many people coming across the border.

What happens to that information? Guess what, folks? They don't want us to have it. They don't want the GAO to have it because then we would know that our back door is wide open.

I mean, these gaps on the border lead to higher crime rates and unemployment for American citizens. It is really no more complicated than your own home. Sure, you love your neighbor to your left and your right and the people that adjoin your home to the north and to the south, but that doesn't mean that you leave your doors wide open for them to come in and go as they please at all hours of the day or night.

We want to be a country that is defined by who we are, and it requires protecting. If we are not going to define our country in those ways, why define it by having a border at all? That is what I think the President and many on the other side would propose, that we just abolish the borders. Well, guess what, folks? If we abolish the borders, we don't have any country at all.

I was thinking about another thing I heard recently. Over the last 6 years of the couple million jobs that were created in a downturn economy, almost all of them, statistically, were filled by people that weren't born in this country. Listen, it is great to have people come here and we need to have that policy, a smart policy, but our policy should be what works for America first, and securing our border and doing what works for America is the right thing to do. It is our duty. It is our oath.

Now, people say: Well, why is it so important?

Look at the crime rates. More than 40 percent of all criminal cases initiated by Federal prosecutors were in districts that border Mexico. Is anybody surprised? Do you think that that doesn't correlate to something? That means something, folks. I mean, the Governor of Texas, Rick Perry, stated more than 3,000 homicides were committed by illegal immigrants in the last 6 years.

Now, are we a nation of laws or aren't we? If we are a nation of laws, what does it matter if you have a law that you are not going to enforce? Does it mean anything? The President has not executed the law for biometric exit. That is where we determine who you are, what you are doing here, and when you leave. Come legally, come across our border, but that is part of securing the border. But when it is time to go, it is time to go. If you want to stay, hey, that is great, but show up and let our government know that you are going to stay a little bit longer and what your purpose is. We don't want

you to stay if your purpose is for something other than what it should be.

The Congress has spoken, as a matter of fact, eight times passed a law requiring an exit system at all our ports; yet the executive branch, the one who executes the laws, has decided that is not important. They are just not going to do it.

Folks, this puts us at a huge disadvantage. It makes us unsafe. We are not secure in our homes. We don't have the peace of mind of knowing that we are safe in our homes. We don't have the peace of mind of knowing that the people coming across the border are being screened for maybe diseases or criminal activity.

There is a cost to that. There is a cost in lives. There is a financial cost to that in caring for people that get diseases that we have long eradicated in America that now come across the border unchecked because our border is wide open. That is why it is important to secure the border.

It is important. Congress has spoken. Congress, the representative of the American people, has spoken eight times on this issue, and the President has just said: I can't be bothered. He designates Federal lands, and our own agents can't be on these Federal lands and do their job.

I mean, who thinks that controlling the border and securing the border means being 50 miles off the border? I guarantee you, if you are in the combat zone securing your perimeter, your border—and the gentlelady knows what I am talking about because she has been there herself, as I have been there—you secure your perimeter and you watch your perimeter right on it, not just set up a little fence or draw a line in the sand and then head to the tent and hope nobody crosses it. That doesn't work there, and it doesn't work here. Yet that is what we are doing, and we are espousing it as though it was some kind of policy that is coherent and is realistic. It is not.

Our agents want to do their jobs. They are excited to do the job, they are committed to do the job, and our Federal Government literally is standing in the way and saying: Absolutely, you can't do the job.

We can get some assistance from our State and local, our National Guard, too. I have served on that mission as well. There is a lot of opportunity there to divide the duties and the resources and make this work that is cost effective. There is a lot of expertise from a military standpoint that can be used legally to help secure our borders, but, here again, the President can't be bothered. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable.

We need to keep track of these individuals with radical views. If the President had enacted the biometric requirements that have been required by the United States Congress eight times, maybe the Tsarnaev brothers wouldn't have had the ability to come to Boston and blow up people during the marathon. But we will never know because they just come and go as they darn well please to our country, and we don't ask anything. How is that securing the country? How is that good for America?

Mr. Speaker, thanks again to the gentlelady for hosting this. This is an incredibly important subject that we need to be discussing, and it is great that we have some time on the House floor to discuss this.

I hope what this does is it kind of gets the people that are watching this to say: Huh, maybe there is something to this. Maybe I should call my Representative. What does he or she think? How would he or she vote on such a border bill? Is there something missing in the bill, and is there some reason they wouldn't support the bill, and what is that? What would I like, as an American, to see about my border? Should we be letting anybody that darn well pleases come across the border unchecked to come into my community and do whatever they would, take my job, harm my family, or do I want something more as an American? Where does my Representative stand?

I think it is a great opportunity to call your Representative, write your Representative, email, talk to his staff and say: What does my Representative think of this?

So I appreciate the opportunity. I appreciate your leadership. I know, I have been to where you live.

Ms. MCSALLY. You know what we are dealing with.

Mr. PERRY. Yes.

I have flown on the Arizona border down there. I have crossed the border in Nogales, and I have been privileged to be there. America is not where it needs to be on this. The Congress is, but we need to pass a bill, and we need the President to execute it.

I thank you very much for the opportunity.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. PERRY, and thank you for your support, again, of this urgent matter and the bill that we hopefully will be bringing before our colleagues as soon as possible, because every day that goes by is a day that our ranchers and border residents are still dealing with this.

Before I recognize my next colleague here, I just want to paint the picture of what we have seen go on in the different sectors. In the early 1990s, the San Diego sector is really where most of the illegal activity, the transnational criminal organizations were just at will crossing into the San Diego sector. A lot was done there.

We were visiting it 10 days ago. We got to see the new tactics, the resources, the fencing, the lights, the technology. The agents there are really able to squeeze the activity related in the San Diego sector. These are living organizations, these transnational criminal organizations that are trafficking in our communities and our neighborhoods, so they react. It is like squeezing a balloon.

Guess what happened? They tightened up in San Diego, and that meant that these organizations were now coming in and out of my community. The sector in Tucson put up some fencing and other resources in more populated areas around Nogales, but then that pushed the activity out into the rural areas where the Ladd ranch is that we visited. Mr. Chairman mentioned Jack Ladd, third generation rancher, and John Ladd, fourth generation rancher, with about 10 miles on the border right there. We got to see firsthand what they are dealing with.

These organizations are nimble. They are going to respond and react, and they are going to move. As we create obstacles and we address in certain areas, they are going to move to other areas. What we have seen in the Tucson sector, from fiscal year 1998 up until fiscal year 2012, we have had the highest number of apprehensions. We have had the highest number of assaults in the last couple of years. In the last few years, we have had the highest amount of marijuana seized.

By the way, we don't know what the denominator is, though. Apprehensions is the numerator, but we don't know what the denominator is because our agents do not have full situational awareness. And you can just look at the price of drugs on the street. This is a supply-and-demand issue. If the cost is still low, which it is, it means that we are still not catching a whole lot that is trafficking in and out of these neighborhoods.

So again, the potential for violence is up, and even though the numbers of apprehensions are down in the last few years, those that live on the border—and the Border Patrol has confirmed to me the types of people that are coming—are more the transnational criminal organizations, the traffickers. It is drugs and people coming north and weapons and money coming south, and they have more of a criminal record, and the potential for danger is certainly up.

I do have some stories to share, but I know I have a number of colleagues who want to join the conversation, so I will yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

What, do you have, 800 miles? I only have 80. You have, I think, 800 in your district.

□ 1645

Mr. HURD of Texas. 820 miles of the border, from San Antonio to El Paso.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman for the time today and also for taking me to your district and seeing that part of the border. Our trip a few weeks ago was great, enlightening to me.

I have spent a lot of time crisscrossing those 820 miles of the border, and it was great to see how the San Diego sector and Tucson and my fellow Texans in McAllen are doing the same thing.

As the gentlewoman knows, I spent 9 years as an undercover officer in the

CIA. I chased groups like al Qaeda and the Taliban. I have chased narcotraffickers all over the world, and the threat is increasing, and the threat is sophisticated.

The drug trafficking organizations in Mexico are making $50 billion a year in the United States. That is a big number. Their tactics, techniques, and procedures are sophisticated, and we need to keep up. It is about moves and countermoves.

What I like about this bill is it empowers our members of Border Patrol to do their job. A lot of people talk about border security. I like to refine it a little bit. Part of it is interdiction, stopping people before they get to the border. It is grabbing them, it is having them in custody, and then it is removal. This bill is focused on this first piece of border security which is interdiction.

We need to make sure that our men and women that are on the border every single day have the tools that they need in order to do their job. It is different in Tucson. It is different in Eagle Pass. It is different in San Diego. What I like about this bill that was developed under the leadership of Chairman MCCAUL is that it gives them that freedom and flexibility.

Having spent a lot of time overseas, I know the disconnect between the field and headquarters, and that is going on right here on our border. We need to make sure that the guys and gals that are on the border have the tools that they need.

This is a sophisticated threat, as you alluded to, using ultralight aircraft to deliver their payload. They are using tactics that intelligence organizations have used all across the world to do denial and deception. We need to make sure we have all the resources—things like the aerostats, things like radar technology, things like UAVs—in order to have that combined picture of the border.

This is something that for 19 months, I talked to folks in the district. I know, like you, this was a very important issue. The American people sent us up here to do our job, and our job is to protect our citizens and to protect our homeland. This bill does it. It is a strong bill, and I look forward to working over these next few days and weeks in order to make this happen.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. HURD. Again, thank you for your leadership on this issue as well. It is great to be working together with individuals who have operational experience and understand what it takes to get the job done, so I look forward to working with you.

Mentioning the ultralights, I was with our CBP team for several hours a couple of weekends ago and was actually on a Black Hawk getting an aerial tour of the border. We tried to intercept an ultralight. We had a radar hit. We went over to the area. The challenge there is these things are small specks, and you don't have any sense of what altitude they are flying at.

We looked around. We were eyes in the sky. We were trying to find them. As quickly as we have a last radar hit, they pack up, they are out of there, or they are flying back low over the border, and we can't find them. We don't know what they have dropped and where.

These are some of the challenges that our agents have out there in trying to address this threat. It is a very nimble and sophisticated cartel, transactional criminal organizations that are reacting to us. They are much more nimble than we are.

My colleague, Mr. KATKO from New York, if you want to share your perspectives.

Mr. KATKO. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for her wonderful career serving our country. You are serving your country in a much different capacity now, but I want to honor you for what you have done for your country in the past. I also want to thank you for taking a leadership role tonight and having this session so we can discuss the border security bill in more detail.

I also want to thank Chairman MCCAUL for his great leadership and his ability and desire to empower the young Congressmen and Congresswomen, such as you and I, to take leadership roles with respect to the Homeland Security Committee.

I talk about the border security bill from a law enforcement perspective. For the last 20 years, before I came to Congress, I was a Federal prosecutor for the United States of America in the Department of Justice.

I started my career in 1994 and, soon thereafter, was sent to the southwest border in El Paso, Texas, as part of the Southwest Border Initiative. Back then, it was just simply to try and stem the incredible tide of drugs coming across the border. When I got there, I was stunned to see how wide open the border was. To my understanding, it remains so to this day.

When I was down there, I was prosecuting cartel-level drug trafficking cases. We could get on the roof of the U.S. attorney's office and look across the border and see a cartel member's house on a bluff overlooking the United States. It was wide open, and it remains so.

It was dangerous for Border Patrol. It was dangerous for people living along the border. In some respects, it has become even more dangerous for ranchers and law-abiding citizens.

After a few years there and getting great experience and great perspective, I was sent to Puerto Rico to do similar drug trafficking prosecutions and organized crime cases, and I saw a different perspective, that of being 500 nautical miles from Colombia.

My first day in Puerto Rico, the Federal building's parking lot was lined with boats that were seized that were smuggling hundreds of kilos of cocaine at a time across the 500-mile strait from Colombia.

The last 16 years have been in Syracuse, New York, in the northern district of New York, where we have 300 miles of border with our brothers and sisters to the north in Canada.

While it is definitely a different dynamic than being on the southwest border, the fact remains that less than 4 percent of the Canadian border with the United States is secure. It is wide open. It varies from the northern plains in the Central United States to the Northeast, where there are several major cities along the border with the United States, and that brings a different problem.

In the northern district, over the last 16 years, we have dedicated several individual prosecutors to deal with nothing but alien smuggling, illegal entry cases, and major league drug cases on the northern border. We have well-worn smuggling routes in our district, well-worn alien smuggling routes.

In addition to alien smuggling, we have major drug trafficking from the north coming down south, that being hydroponic marijuana. It is a multibillion-dollar a year industry in Canada. That comes south.

It has developed now that cocaine is going north. The Canadian drug traffickers have hooked up with the Mexican cartels, and cocaine is coming north through our district. Guns are going north. Contraband cigarettes are going north. Like I said, many ethnically based alien smuggling rings are in our district.

I say all that to point to the fact that there is a problem on the northern border as well. Everything that is being prescribed in this bill for the southwest border and the southern border is being prescribed for the northern border.

The prescription for the northern border is based on discussions with Border Patrol and the different sectors throughout the northern United States, just like they did in the southwest border in the pieces of legislation regarding that.

It is the first time in 20 years of being a prosecutor that I saw a bill that actually looks like it is addressing the problem altogether, at once, and that is critically important.

While I was running for this office, I made it clear that my opinion is that we need full immigration reform, but any immigration reform has to start with securing our borders. It is foolhardy to do anything other than that.

This is the first step towards immigration reform, and I wholly applaud it. I do not think this bill is unduly burdensome to travelers coming to and from the United States on the northern border. We have many. To the extent there are burdens, we will address those.

I do say that, moving forward, this is the right bill, it is at the right time, and I applaud everyone who is supporting it, and I hope that we can get this passed.

A related bill to that, which I have submitted to Congress and will be considered as early as next week, is a northern border threat assessment.

It has become clear to me that the northern border has not had a threat assessment done in a detailed fashion like it needs to be done, so this bill simply orders a threat assessment to be done and a report back to us to see if there is any additional legislation or funding needed to address concerns along the northern border.

In short, we don't know the extent of the threat in the northern border, and this bill will help us. With those two bills combined—particularly the border security bill—I am confident that we can get a handle on the problems on both sides of the border, north and south.

I applaud you for your efforts. I applaud everyone else who is supporting the bill. I echo the sentiments of my colleagues before me, and I urge the good citizens of the United States to contact their leaders and ask that this bill get passed.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. KATKO, for your leadership and the great experience you are bringing to Congress. It is wonderful to have a freshman class with people like you. You bring a unique experience. You also remind us it is not just the southern border, so thanks for your great additions to the bill.

Next, I will invite Mr. CARTER from Georgia to join in the conversation.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Thank you very much. Let me begin by complimenting you and applauding your efforts, the gentlewoman from Arizona. Your leadership in this has been invaluable. We appreciate it very much. You have taken a leading role in this.

I also want to compliment and applaud the chairman of Homeland Security, Chairman MCCAUL, for his tenacity in assuring that this gets done.

For most of us, when we go home and we talk about illegal immigration or we talk about the terrorists or the threat of terrorism or when we talk about drug smuggling, the one thing that our constituents say is: Secure the border. Secure the border.

That is always the first thing they say, regardless of what we are talking about, whether it is illegal immigrants, whether it is terrorism, the threat of terrorism. They always say that first, and it is very important.

Now, I will be quite honest with you. I am from south Georgia, and I don't get out a whole lot. In fact, quite honestly, this is the first time I have ever been to the southwest border. I have never been to California before I went on this trip. I have never been to Arizona. Although I have been to Texas, I have never been to the Rio Grande, so it was an eye-opening experience for me.

Before I went there, I think that I was like most of my constituents and like many Americans. I would watch what is happening on TV, and I would holler at the TV: Build a fence. Build a fence.

Ms. MCSALLY. Right.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Well, after you visited and after you talked to the Border Patrol agents, after you talked to the ranchers, after you talked to the local officials, you realize that in each sector, that is not necessarily the answer—that in certain sectors, yes, a fence is needed, but in other areas, in other sectors, that is not what is needed.

We need more technology. We need boots on the ground. Those are the types of things we need in certain sectors, and that was eye opening. That was one of the takeaways that I had from this trip.

Ms. MCSALLY. I wanted to point to one of the visuals we have here. Again, this is from the area in my sector where you can see we do have a fence, but the area that is cut out here in the middle is where the cartels very quickly come up, and they cut it out, and they are across that border in a minute or 2 minutes, maximum.

I will give some other examples later, but this is just a visual example of the fence delays the activity, as you saw when you came to visit, but it is not the answer to build a fence and then walk away because they are smart, they are resourceful, they are adaptive, and they are very quickly getting through many different types of fencing, both pedestrian and vehicle fences.

Thanks for bringing that up.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Well, thank you. That was the first takeaway I had.

The second takeaway I had from this trip was, for most of us, when we think of the southwestern border, we just think about illegal immigration, but it is much, much more than that.

When you think about the drug cartels that are in Mexico, south of us, when you think about the drug smugglers that are bringing those drugs poisoning our children, poisoning families, ruining families, when you think about that, when you think about the terrorism threat we face as a nation, that shows you just how porous our borders are and just how important this issue is.

Again, that is why this bill is so important—because it addresses that. Yes, it addresses fencing, and it calls for fencing where fencing is necessary. It addresses boots on the ground. It helps us to bolster the number of people and the number of agents that we have in certain areas, and we need that. It also takes into consideration technology. It utilizes the resources that we have.

It is a smart bill. It is a good bill. It is a vital bill—a vital bill—to our national security. That is why I am glad I went on the trip. It was very educational, very eye opening to me.

I am supporting this bill. I hope that my colleagues will support this bill. It is essential and vital to our national security.

Again, thank you, the gentlewoman from Arizona, for the work that you are doing, and thank you to Chairman MCCAUL.

Ms. MCSALLY. Again, thank you, Mr. CARTER, for your comments. Again, thanks for coming to visit my community and listening to the residents there that are dealing with this, having that ear and coming back as an advocate and a leader on this issue. Thanks for supporting this bill. I really appreciate it.

Mr. PALMER from Alabama, would you like to join the conversation?

Mr. PALMER. I would. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for the work you have done on this. I know this has been—I don't want to say a labor of love, but you have an incredible sense of urgency, I think perhaps more than anyone that I have been involved with, a sense of how important this is.

I want to talk a little bit about the fence. Like the gentleman from Georgia, I have been to the border before but not in the context of examining our border security. I am a strong proponent of the fence. I have been all along.

What this trip opened my eyes to is the fact that the fence by itself is not enough. It is an impediment. One of the things that was impressed upon me on this trip was the sophistication of the cartels and the people across the border in breaching our fence and breaching our security.

□ 1700

There is some pretty serious engineering going on here. When we were in San Diego, for instance, we saw where we have double-layer fencing. We have got the metal mat, landing mat fence on the Mexico side. We have got the high, the heavy gauge fence with the razor wire at the top on the U.S. side.

They are using hardened blades for laser saws. It literally takes 1 minute to cut through there. All along that fence you saw where it was patched and what the border patrol calls doggy doors. They cut it out in three places, push it open, and they are through.

The interesting thing is there, you have got 3 million people in Tijuana on the Mexico side, and you have got 3 million in San Diego. Almost the minute they are through, they are assimilated.

But the thing that is going on there is the cooperation between local law enforcement, the Coast Guard, the Border Patrol, and how diligent they are to be there immediately once that line is breached to interdict that.

They have been so effective at it that they are now pushing these folks offshore. They are using the panga boats now, and the Coast Guard, working with the Border Patrol and local law enforcement, have been so good at interdicting that they are forcing them up the coast of California. That is not the case in Arizona.

What people need to understand is that just building the fence and pulling back and thinking that is going to stop them—I don't care how high we build it, how wide we build it, how many layers we have; if we don't have people in forward operating positions to interdict these people when they are staging

to come across, we are not going to stop them.

The picture that you are showing there next to you is the fence in Arizona, and the attention was drawn to where they had cut through the mesh there. That is not the thing that got my attention.

If you will notice there, those are 6-inch I-beams supported by 6-inch channel. That is quarter-inch carbon steel. That is all along that border.

They came along there, with these hardened blades, laser saws, cut through the I-beam, cut through the channel, folded it over, ramped over, and drove trucks over it.

Now, this was not reported in the national media. I am not sure that there was any discussion about it from this administration. It was the local media that picked up on it. The ranchers know about this.

But I think—and you can correct me if I am wrong—but I think they said there have been 47 vehicles that crossed over that. These are pickup trucks loaded with drugs and other items, contraband, whether it is guns or drugs or human trafficking. But that is the issue.

Ms. MCSALLY. If the gentleman will yield, I will elaborate a little bit on that. That was on Mr. Ladd's ranch less than two weeks ago, where we saw that, and they showed where they ramped over.

According to Mr. Ladd, there have been 47 drive-throughs on his ranching area in the last about 2½ years.

That particular case was caught by the Sierra Vista police, which is a town a little bit further inland, because the truck just didn't look right. It was weighed down. Its wheels looked a little funny, and they got about $600,000 worth of marijuana, 2,000 pounds of marijuana they caught on that vehicle alone. So that is just an example of what is happening.

Mr. PALMER. Well, think about the staging that had to take place for that, that a vehicle that heavy, to be able to cross that fence, obviously—and the interesting thing is they used our own I-beam and channel to support the ramps that would bear that weight for that truck to get over it.

This is not a static situation. Just building the fence is not enough. We have got to have the aerial surveillance, the unmanned aircraft, the aerostats.

Looking into Mexico and seeing the staging that takes place for an operation like that to take place—you have been in the military, you understand this—that if you are going to—it literally looked like a military operation where they cut this down and ramped over it and drove over it.

If we are looking into Mexico and see that, we need people in forward operating bases that can react immediately, not 20 minutes later, not 30 minutes later, because they are already over and gone.

So this has got to be a combination of things. I am fine with the fence. We can build the fence as high and wide and as long as we want to, but we have got to be able to interdict.

We have got to be able to see them staging, because they are not carrying ramping material on their backs for 3 or 4 miles to the fence. This happened fairly close to the fence, and we should have been able to see that and stop it.

The other issue is the morale, and the fact that we don't—that we are not doing anything about catch and release has really hurt the morale, I think, with our law enforcement and with our Border Patrol.

And it definitely has hurt the morale of the ranchers. My heart really goes out to those guys. They have been there through many generations. They have put in their blood, sweat, and tears in this. And it is not just that they love their ranch. They love their country, and it was very evident in what they had to say.

I think it is incumbent upon us, as Members of Congress, to do our duty to protect the border.

And the other thing, again, going back to the morale, it is different in San Diego, it is different in Arizona, it is different in Texas. What we need to do—and I am very, very grateful for the work that is being done to bring alongside this bill an enforcement bill.

We have got to do this, I think, in a way that makes sense to the American people. Build the fence, secure the border, but have the right enforcement that goes along with this, that makes the work that our Border Patrol is doing worthwhile. When they catch the bad guys they need to be able to—there ought to be some consequences for it.

Earlier, Mr. PERRY from Pennsylvania made this point about, when are you forward-deployed in a combat zone, you secure your perimeter. There are consequences if you cross that perimeter a little more lethal than they would be here, but, in all honesty, we have got to do these things together.

I applaud you for the work you are doing. It is extremely important, and I look forward to working with you on this.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. PALMER. I appreciate it.

Just to elaborate a little bit on what my colleague was talking about, the challenge we have—the men and women in Border Patrol are doing the best they can. They are my constituents as well. I really appreciate them every day putting on the uniform and doing the job they are doing.

But the strategy is not working for those who live in these rural areas near the border, and we need a strategy that pushes our intelligence deeper south of the border, using intelligence-driven operations, so that we can use some of these airborne assets and radars in order to detect the cartel activity, detect the movement, monitor the movement.

Then these forward operating bases are critical. The bill—in consultation with the chairman, they agreed to add in two forward operating bases in Tucson to get the Border Patrol operating right at the border so that we can either prevent the activity or they can very quickly respond to it when they see a breach happening, a challenging response time if they are further inland or in some of the tougher terrain.

So some of the things that I added into an amendment to address this issue are related to the fact that right now they are focused on defense in depth. So sometimes we are seeing mules and traffickers—and I will show a picture here—oftentimes, 30, 40, 50 miles inland.

This is just one example of mules with packs on their backs. So they are trafficking across private property while they are moving into the defense in-depth strategy, and that is just not working.

So we have got to get the Border Patrol closer to the border. I offered an amendment. I am glad the committee agreed to it, to get the Border Patrol closer to the border, have them patrolling on the south side of John Ladd's ranch and not on the north side.

Have those forward operating bases manned to the max extent possible and also developing a quick reaction capability, so that when we see the activity happening, they can quickly get—especially in these areas of tough terrain—to stop the activity or intercept it as soon as possible when it comes over the border; because this, again, if they are coming through Mr. Ladd's ranch and some of the other ranchers', they don't know who it is. They don't know if they are armed. They don't know what their intentions are, and it puts them at risk on a daily basis

Mr. PALMER. If the gentlelady would yield, I would like to add one other thing to that.

This bill would allow access through Federal lands, and it has created a huge impediment for Border Patrol in the interdiction of people like this, whether they are coming across on foot or coming across in vehicles, if our Border Patrol do not have access to roads through Federal land. So that is another very important component of this bill.

And then, last thing. Down in Texas we have got this Caruso cane on the banks of the river that basically is a natural hiding place for people who are crossing the river. We have got to allow our Border Patrol to take whatever measures are necessary to eliminate those type of natural hiding places and barriers to interdiction.

So all of this is extremely important. I am glad you put that picture up because I don't think people fully appreciate, when you talk about people bringing drugs across the border, the massive amounts that can cross just on the backs of individuals.

Ms. MCSALLY. Exactly. Thank you, Mr. PALMER.

Now I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding. It

was a pleasure to travel to your southern border. I have traveled to the southern border of California many times. And as we saw on the entire border security trip, our entire southern border is very different depending on which State and which area of the State that you are in.

In my home State of California, we saw the jet skis that were coming along the surf that were bringing in a couple of illegal aliens at the time. We have got to be able to address that from a Coast Guard perspective.

And when you have double fencing in those high urban areas, we saw the Vietnam landing strips that, at one time, were a very good piece to add along border security when we had nothing. But now we have got to replace that with new fence that will allow our Border Patrol agents to actually see through and address it when there is a weakened area in that fence.

We have got to go much further. Along the California border we also have a number of mountains and even cliffs where we have to address the border differently. And in your area, we saw where a truck was able to cut through, while you had a big fence, was able to cut through that fence and actually go across the border into your area, which is why we need the VADER technology.

We saw some of the technology that is being redeployed from Afghanistan, and with that infrared technology, we actually saw individuals coming across the border.

But with the VADER technology, we can actually see 150 miles. So you would see people actually lining up on the border or preparing to bring drugs across.

Now we can actually work with our counterparts in Mexico to actually go and address it from their perspective before it even gets on to American soil.

So there is much more that we can do, both with technology that is coming back from Afghanistan, coming back from Iraq, as well as new technology that will give the American public the assurance that we have the measurements and metrics in place to secure our border.

Part of our challenge right now is not knowing how many people are coming across. If you never know how many people are coming across, you can never address how many you are actually catching, and the metrics are on how many people are actually coming into our country.

If we are going to have a full debate on immigration, we have to first give the American public the sense and the security that we need and deserve, and this bill will do just that.

We have to do it now. We can no longer wait until there is another surge of 50 or 60,000 unaccompanied minors or family units that are coming across the Texas border, where they are just hopping in a boat, going 100 yards, and stepping on American soil and then looking for refuge.

We have to send that message across Central America, across South America, that we are actually sending the message that our borders are secure, and this isn't going to just be an automatic path during the summer months across that river.

Many things we can do. Many things we need to do. This bill will give us the measurements and metrics to secure our border.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. DENHAM. I appreciate you coming to visit our district to see that firsthand, and I look forward to working with you as well on getting this bill across the finish line.

One thing I think is important for those who are watching to know is we have had a variety of people speak in support of this bill. Often we have different views on some other topics or even what we should be doing as we are addressing some of the other challenges related to immigration. But we are all in agreement on one thing, which is we need to secure the border; that this is an urgent issue.

Across the spectrum, this is something that unites those of us within the conference, and really should unite this body.

I know my community is a very split district politically, but everyone agrees, whether they are Democrat, Independent or Republican, they want their family to be safe and secure. They want their community to be safe and secure, and this bill does that.

So it is time that we work together to get this thing passed. So thank you, Mr. DENHAM.

I will continue to tell a few stories here from my district that I do want to share.

Mr. PERRY, I yield for just a minute. I do have a number of things I do want to share before we wrap up.

Mr. PERRY. We want to make sure that we get all the information out about this. As I said, the GAO's best estimate, I think, is about 56 percent of the border is not secured.

Another thing to mention about this bill is that we are looking for 100 percent. Now, we understand, just like law enforcement, they don't catch every criminal, and sometimes prisoners escape from prison, but we expect the warden to secure the prison, and the plan is to keep everybody in prison in prison.

But with this bill we expect 100 percent, and it is important to note that the other side would have us diminish that standard.

□ 1715

Right now, GAO is saying that 50 percent of the border is unmonitored and not secured. We actually have people in this Congress saying let's lessen the standard that we have currently right now, and the best we can get is 50-some percent.

I don't know who in their life plans to fail, doesn't plan to exceed and do the maximum. Whether it is showing up for work on time or anything you endeavor in, nobody shoots for below the bar. You shoot for the best. Yet in this endeavor, we have people literally in this Congress who are saying let's actually do less than we can do—actually, let's do less than we are doing right now. So that seems to fly in the face of what every single American, regardless of your positions on other things, feels about securing the border.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you so much. I appreciate it, Mr. PERRY.

Again, I have about 10 minutes to wrap up here. I do want to tell some stories related to the level of activity in the district and how it is impacting real people in southern Arizona and their families and the threat that has been increasing.

For those who are not aware, Rob Krentz is a rancher in my district, and he was killed. He was murdered on his own ranch in 2010. This is as it was reported by The Arizona Republic:

On a breezy spring morning, a red ATV rolled across southeastern Arizona's border badlands beneath the mystical Chiricahua Mountains. A gray-haired rancher in classic cowboy attire—jeans, boots, denim vest, and shirt—was at the wheel, accompanied by his dog, Blue.

Robert Krentz, 58, was checking stock ponds and water lines on the 35,000-acre spread not far from where Apache leader Geronimo surrendered to the U.S. cavalry. The Krentz clan began raising cattle there more than a century ago, shortly before Mexican Revolution leader Pancho Villa prowled nearby. In modern times, the sparsely populated San Bernardino Valley, bordering New Mexico and Senora, became a magnet for bird watchers and a haven for smugglers.

Krentz pulled to a stop, as he noticed a man apparently injured. The rancher made a garbled radio call to his brother, Phil—something about an illegal alien hurt; call Border Patrol. It was about 10:30 a.m., March 27, 2010.

What happened that morning as shots echoed across the grassy range would roil Arizona politics and fuel the U.S. immigration debate for years to come.

One day earlier, Phil had put Border Patrol agents onto a group of suspected drug runners on the family's land, resulting in eight arrests and the seizure of 200 pounds of marijuana.

After Krentz's broken radio transmission, family members almost immediately launched a search.

And also neighbors. There were other ranchers in the area that started this search, trying to track the killers, and they enlisted help to track the footsteps south.

Rob was found just before midnight, his body lying on the ground with his feet still inside the all-terrain vehicle. Two 9-millimeter slugs had fatally penetrated his lungs. Another bullet wounded his dog, which had to be euthanized. Krentz carried a rifle and pistol in his Polaris Ranger but apparently never got a chance to use them. After being shot, he managed to drive about 1,000 feet before collapsing.

The only immediate sign of an assailant was a set of footprints. Trackers followed them nearly 20 miles south to Mexico, where the trail vanished.

His murderers have never been caught to this day. Rob Krentz' family deals with this grief and deals with the

fear of the border not being secured and what is going to happen next to them. This is very real in southern Arizona.

In 2010, Brian Terry, a Border Patrol agent, was also murdered by smugglers in our district.

On December 14, 2010, Border Patrol Agents William Castano, Gabriel Fragoza, Timothy Keller, and Brian Terry demonstrated extreme bravery while facing a lethal threat from a superior number of armed subjects suspected of trafficking drugs in the area.

And I am reading from a citation, where he earned the 2010 Congressional Badge of Bravery.

All four agents were operating as members of a small four-man rural assault element tasked with interdicting armed suspects operating west of the town of Rio Rico, Arizona. This four-man element had occupied a remote interdiction site consisting of rugged, steep, and difficult terrain for a period of 48 hours without relief.

At approximately 11 p.m., the team was alerted to at least five suspects moving into the interdiction zone. Without regard for individual safety, the small team maneuvered into a position to interdict and apprehend the five individuals passing directly in front of them. As the agents identified themselves, suddenly and without warning, the subjects opened fire on them. Placing themselves at great risk of serious physical injury or death, all four agents bravely stood their ground in an attempt to provide vital protection for their teammates.

During the short and horrific gun battle, Agent Brian Terry sustained a fatal injury. Realizing that Agent Terry had been injured, the team, without hesitation, continued to selflessly place themselves in harm's way by attempting to provide lifesaving techniques for Agent Terry and providing perimeter security, preventing the assailants from maneuvering on their position. One of the suspects was wounded during the incident and was ultimately taken into custody.

Brian Terry is a hero. Rob Krentz was on his property when he was murdered. Brian Terry was brutally murdered.

Let me tell you another story, one of rancher Kelly Glenn Kimbro, a fourth generation rancher. I am reading from an email that she sent to me in June, just an incident that she had on her ranch east of Douglas.

A couple of days ago, I was driving from the Malpai Ranch to Douglas on Geronimo Trail. At mile marker 11, I could see motion ahead of me in the road; and as I approached, 13 men formed a barricade with their bodies across the road. I slowed and tried to pass on the right. They moved right. I had locked my doors as I approached and my windows were up.

Knowing that I had to either run over several of them, I stopped. They immediately surrounded my truck. Two fellows stood in front of my truck with their hands on the hood, holding me in place. Several guys started to climb onto the running boards and into the back. One was rummaging around my tools. I was thinking that if he proceeded to break a window that I would possibly use my pistol. I was not sure if I was being hijacked or what.

Think about it. This is a woman alone in her truck, with 13 men stopping her in her tracks.

I put my window down a couple inches and told them to get back. They started talking English. They were frantic to have me take them to the ''police.'' They stated they were from India. I talked them out of my truck and back onto the side of the road, promised them I would, no doubt, call Border Patrol, and they let me leave.

Yep, scared me for a few minutes.

Let me tell you, Kelly Glenn Kimbro is a tough woman. She is a rancher. She is a mountain lion hunter. She is cool under pressure. How would you behave in that circumstance?

The challenge that she has—and she has got an 18-year-old daughter who often drives home alone. They are having to make life-and-death decisions. How did she know that they were not armed? How did she know what their intentions were? And if she decided to hit the gas and did harm them, then they would be questioning her actions because they were, in fact, unarmed.

This is just the type of circumstances that these people are dealing with, just living in their own homes, just going in and out of their own community, just traveling to the store and going about their business.

There are a couple of other stories.

Gary Thrasher is a rancher and veterinarian who has worked and practiced in Cochise County since 1984. Over the past 30 years, he has seen how border security issues have led to dramatic changes in the county's way of life.

Gary lives about 3 miles from the border. Over the past 4 years, 11 of his ranch family clients have sold out, and that has had a big economic impact on his practice as well. They have just decided to give up. They can't afford to ranch in the area under this danger anymore. Many of those families have just said that they can't deal with the threats and the anxieties of life along the U.S.-Mexico border; and for the ranchers who remain, it has become increasingly hard to find people who want to work on their ranch near a border that is constantly crossed with these transnational criminal organizations.

Another rancher shared, anonymously, that he has got a couple of houses, one 2 miles and one 40 miles from the border, and he has got far more trouble at the house 40 miles from the border. He has had, according to him, 15 to 16 break-ins, home invasions, and one of them was just 3 weeks ago.

One last story from another rancher. He and his son, they said they left the ranch. Someone broke in, stole food, and then they left. The next day, they saw individuals moving north. The son pursued them, and the Border Patrol then captured them. It turned out, according to this rancher, that, after breaking into his ranch, they broke into a hunter's property and stole a weapon. The pistol was ditched before they were caught but connected back to them. Who knows what their intentions were.

This is the challenge that these people have.

The rancher talked with the migrant criminal. And he said he admitted to being a lifetime criminal and a repeat offender. He is just used by these traffickers going back and forth. He was detained for 2 days, and he wasn't charged with weapons charges or multiple entries, and he was sent back to Mexico, again, to probably be used by these transnational criminal organizations.

This is very real to southern Arizona. The transnational criminal organizations are daily trafficking.

There is another photo I have right here, and you can see on the other side of the photo, a number of individuals that are just mules. They are packing drugs, and they are just going through their property.

There are other photos I have here related to some of the ranchers who—there is just no fence. Again, as we talked about earlier, the fence is not the only solution, but fencing will at least delay the activity. This is just one of the rancher's pictures of just a barbed wire fence that is easy to be cut through on foot or with a vehicle.

So I am urging my colleagues to pass this border security bill. I am urging those who are listening to please contact your Members of Congress in the House and the Senate. Let's not play politics with securing our border. Now is the time.

These ranchers have put up with this for decades. They have cooperated with Border Patrol. Border Patrol is doing the best they can, but we have got to change the strategy, and we have got to address this issue. It should be a bipartisan issue and something that unites us. Let's get the job done so we can protect the people of southern Arizona, the people of Texas, the people living in other border communities, and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for allowing me to be a designee for this moment in time.

I am also very appreciative for this special time. This is Black History Month, and it is a very special month in the life of African Americans. But if the truth be told, it is a special month in the life of all Americans because Black history is American history.

I had the opportunity just a couple of nights ago to appear on the floor with a couple of my colleagues, the Honorable DONALD PAYNE, JR., from New Jersey and the Honorable ROBIN KELLY from Illinois. They were here to have a Special Order hour. I want to compliment them because that Special Order hour, indeed, dealt with a lot of Black history. They talked about 50

years from Selma—where we were, where we are now, and where we are headed. They did such a great job that I thought it appropriate to acknowledge the outstanding effort and the fact that a good number of Members were very supportive of what they did. I am honored to also say that we plan to continue that tonight with this Special Order time, and we will talk about Black History Month, but from a slightly different perspective.

We are honored to say that this resolution that we have introduced into Congress—it was introduced on January 6, 2015—this is the ninth time that I have had the pleasure of introducing this resolution, and it has 24 original cosponsors. And I want to thank all of the original cosponsors for being a part of helping this resolution come to the floor for this Special Order time.

We are not here for the purpose of passage, but we are here for the purpose of expressing much about Black history and explaining why this resolution is so important. It is important not only to me and the people in my district, which is, quite frankly, one of the most diverse districts in the country—in my district, the ballot is printed in four languages: English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese. Hence, Black History Month is important to not only the African Americans in my district, but all of the other friends, associates, and constituents that I have in my district. They constantly talk to me about Black History Month. We talked about other aspects of history as well, but tonight we will focus on Black history.

It is important to note that this is the 100th anniversary of the organization that promoted and promulgated Black History Month. This organization, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, founded by the Honorable Carter G. Woodson, is the organization that has carried the torch, the flame of hope for history to be inclusive, and they have done an outstanding job.

There was a time that I can remember in my lifetime, in my history book, when there was little mention of the accomplishments of African Americans in history; and in world history, even less. I remember one of my books proclaimed that the reason there was little mention of the nations, the countries in Africa was because they contributed very little to history. Literally, that was the kind of statement that I had to read as a child.

Well, I am honored that we have come a long way from a point wherein we were rarely included to a point where we are included, but I think not enough yet. My hope is that at some point in time we won't have a Black History Month, we won't have any type of history month other than history on a daily basis, because at that point in time we will have included all persons and all of the great cultures in this country in the history of our great Nation.

□ 1730

Black history does not mean that Black people assume that they are better than anyone else. It just means that they would like to be included in history because they believe that no one else is better than we are. We are all the same. We are all God's children, and we all bring special talents and special attributes that make this great country the wonderful place that it is.

Tonight, in talking about this century of Black life, history, and culture in this, the United States of America—and we could make it the world—but let's just talk about the United States since the organization the Association for the Study of African American Life and History was founded in the United States—this is the 100th anniversary—I will ask the question and give some examples of why this question is so important.

The question that I pose tonight is with reference to the giants that we know about in history, and we stand on the shoulders of giants—we all do—the shoulders of giants, people who have done great things to make it possible for us to have these great opportunities that we have, people who suffered many of the slings and arrows of life so that others could have a better quality of life. Many of them are well known. We stand on the shoulders tonight of giants.

The question that I pose is: Whose shoulders do the giants stand on? If we stand on the shoulders of giants, whose shoulders do they stand on?

Thurgood Marshall, one of the greatest litigators in the history of the United States of America, won 29 of 32 cases before the Supreme Court. He was a great litigator and went on to become a Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States of America, the first African American, a giant.

I stand on the shoulders of Thurgood Marshall. A good many people in this Congress stand directly on the shoulders of Thurgood Marshall, in that we are here because of some of the litigation that he won before the Supreme Court of the United States of America. We stand on the shoulders of Thurgood Marshall.

On whose shoulders does Thurgood Marshall stand on? Well, the person that probably shaped his legal career more than any other was the honorable Charles Hamilton Houston. Charles Hamilton Houston was a Harvard lawyer. He was a person who was the dean of the law school at Howard University.

He was the person who concluded that the Constitution of the United States of America did not condone ''separate but equal,'' the person who is said to have killed Jim Crow, the person who was a part of all of the lawsuits of the civil rights era from 1930 to 1954, including Brown v. Board of Education, the honorable Charles Hamilton Houston. He is the person that cultivated and mentored Thurgood Marshall.

Thurgood Marshall came to Howard University after having been a reject at the University of Maryland. He tried to get in, and he could not. In a strange sort of way, it compels me to say: Thank God for the University of Maryland because had they not rejected Thurgood Marshall, he would not have come to Howard University.

There is a good likelihood he would not have met Charles Hamilton Houston and, as a result, may not have acquired the intelligence that Charles Hamilton Houston provided a plethora of lawyers about the Constitution as it relates to ''separate but equal.'' It was Thurgood Marshall who became his prize student. Thurgood Marshall, along with Charles Hamilton Houston, became two of the great litigators to bring down Jim Crow.

One of the cases that Thurgood Marshall and Charles Hamilton Houston brought before the Maryland Court of Appeals, the one that stands out more than any other, is the case of Murray v. Pearson.

In that case, Murray wanted to get into the University of Maryland as well. Isn't it ironic that Thurgood Marshall, who could not get into the institution and who went to Howard University, had the opportunity to become the understudy, if you will, of the honorable Charles Hamilton Houston? Isn't it ironic that the circle comes back to the University of Maryland with one of his first cases after completing law school?

Thurgood Marshall was the lead counsel, along with the honorable Charles Hamilton Houston, against the University of Maryland to bring about an opportunity for the use of the doctrine of ''separate but equal'' being attacked with constitutional provisions, and they were successful.

I am proud to know that while Thurgood Marshall is the giant, a Supreme Court Justice, Thurgood Marshall is known far and wide for his legal prowess. He stood on the shoulders of an even greater giant, an unsung hero to some extent. Well, now, we do know much more about Charles Hamilton Houston than previously in previous years.

It is important to note that he is not the person who has received all of the glory, all of the platitudes, and all of the accolades that Thurgood Marshall received, but he was the architect. I am proud to say that Thurgood Marshall stood on the shoulders of a giant.

Let's go on. Let's talk now about another giant of the civil rights-human rights movement, and that was Rosa Parks. Everyone knows the story—most everyone does—about how Rosa Parks decided that she was going to take her seat. Rosa Parks was a giant. She decided to take a seat in what was, at that time, a racist Southern town.

The story is told that Rosa Parks was tired and that she just had to take her seat because she was tired—not true my friends, not true.

Rosa Parks was an officer in the local NAACP. Rosa Parks was a person

with great standing and credibility in her community. Rosa Parks had stature. Rosa Parks had the backing of the NAACP. Rosa Parks had people who could get her out of jail.

She had people who could work with her and help to stage, if you will, in the minds of some, this moment in time when she literally decided that she was not going to move back nor stand up so that her seat could be held and had by a person of a different hue.

It was a bold thing to do. It was a very bold thing to do in the South, the segregated South at that time, the segregated South where the Constitution accorded us all of the rights of other citizens, but our friends and neighbors denied us those rights that the Constitution accorded us. This was the segregated South, and this was Rosa Parks. She decided to take that seat, backed by the NAACP and backed by a host of persons who were prepared to work with her and support her.

The truth be told, the honorable Rosa Parks, who is considered by many the ''mother of the civil rights movement,'' the honorable Rosa Parks stands and stood at that time on the shoulders of a giant. She stood on the shoulders of a giant that we rarely hear about and rarely read about.

It is the story of a giant who was but 15 years of age at the time she made her mark, if you will, in history. It is the story of a giant who was arrested 9 months before Rosa Parks for doing the same thing that Rosa Park did. She was a 15-year-old girl, Claudette Colvin. She was the first person arrested under the circumstances comparable to Rosa Parks in Montgomery, Alabama.

She went to jail. Little is known about her. Little is known because it was thought at the time that she was not the ideal person around which to rally. It was thought at the time that a more senior person was needed, a person who had greater standing in the community. She was not that person.

Ah, but here is where history—history—tells the story. She was one of four people to file the lawsuit—the lawsuit—that ultimately ended segregation of the bus line in Montgomery, Alabama.

Although Rosa Parks, Dr. King, and the multitudes marched and protested, they marched and they protested for approximately a year or more, it was not the march or protest that actually brought about the ending of this form of invidious discrimination. It was really the lawsuit, Browder v. Gayle. It is important to note that there were four plaintiffs in the lawsuit and that Claudette Colvin was one of those four plaintiffs.

It was that lawsuit that made the difference in the lives of not only those people in Montgomery, but people across the length and breadth of this country because that was one of the first times that the opinion expressed in Brown v. Board of Education was expanded to include public transportation. That was an important, significant event in history.

It was Rosa Parks who received a lot of the credit. I love her, and I think she deserves all the credit she received, but I also think there are these unsung heroes and heroines who have not received their fair share of credit for what they too have done. In fact, they are the shoulders that giants stand on. Claudette Colvin is the giant on whose shoulders Rosa Parks stood on.

Moving to another giant, we all know of Dr. King, and last week and earlier this week, we talked a lot about Selma, and we talked about the march that took place there.

In talking about that march, we talked about how people assembled at a church, and they decided that they were going to march peacefully from Selma to Montgomery. As they proceeded to march, they came to a turning point in history. They came to one of those seminal moments in history that will forever define the life of a country, to be quite candid.

They came to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and they confronted the constabulary on the other side of the Edmund Pettus Bridge. If you have not gone to the Edmond Pettus Bridge, you should go and see the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

If you understand the times that these persons were living in, you have to realize that these were some brave, courageous, and bold souls to be willing to march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, knowing that the constabulary was on the other side with clubs and on horses.

You have to ask yourself candidly: Would you have confronted what you knew was waiting for you in the form of possible death on the Edmond Pettus Bridge?

The Honorable JOHN LEWIS indicates that he thought he was going to die that day because, when confronted by the constabulary with these clubs, they beat the marchers all the way back to the church.

If you see the movie ''Selma,'' you can get a fair depiction and representation of what happened on the Edmund Pettus Bridge. There will be another march this year across the Edmond Pettus Bridge. For those who are interested, I am Congressman AL GREEN. You can call my office, and we will tell you about it. You might want to join us.

Let's talk about the Edmond Pettus Bridge and this march. Dr. King was not there for Bloody Sunday. There were reasons that compelled him to do some other things in his life. There were other persons there. The Honorable JOHN LEWIS was one of them.

In a sense, when Dr. King came back—or he came to Selma following Bloody Sunday to march, he was standing on the shoulders of those who had already gone before him and confronted this constabulary.

Let's really take a closer look at the history—at the history that we rarely talk about and hear about as it relates to the Edmund Pettus Bridge because there is a person that I conclude is the greatest unsung hero of the civil rights movement who had a hidden hand in the march from Selma to Montgomery.

□ 1745

When they went back to make the final march with Dr. King, as they moved across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they had a hidden hand that had signed a court order. That court order was signed by the Honorable Frank M. Johnson, a Republican appointee to a Federal court, appointed by the Honorable President Dwight Eisenhower.

Frank M. Johnson signed the order clearing the way for them to march from Selma to Montgomery. And it is interesting to note that he was a contemporary of George Wallace. In fact, they were classmates. He and George Wallace had a constant confrontation, a mild form of confrontation, sometimes it got a little bit more than mild, but they continually battled each other. Frank M. Johnson was so much of an impact on the times that he had to be guarded 24 hours a day. He was a Federal judge unlike any other. In fact, Dr. King said he put the justice in the word ''justice,'' the Honorable Frank M. Johnson.

So the question becomes, on whose shoulders did Dr. King stand on that day when they marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge? On whose shoulders did the marchers stand on? They stood on the shoulders of a hidden hand of the civil rights movement, the Honorable Frank M. Johnson.

Frank M. Johnson integrated schools, he integrated the jury system. He changed the face of the South, and so little is known about this giant on the shoulders of whom many of the great icons of the civil rights movement stood on that day. This is not to demean or diminish—obviously, we can't—the role of Dr. King and the Honorable JOHN LEWIS; this is simply to say there are others whose stories are not told enough, whose stories should be told more.

And on an occasion like this when we want to celebrate Black history, I think we have to acknowledge that there were unsung heroes and heroines on whose shoulders many of the giants stood on. And we also have to acknowledge that many of these unsung heroes and heroines are not of African ancestry. You see, there really is a White side to Black history. Frank M. Johnson is a part of this White side of Black history. But we also must know that Frank M. Johnson, the great hero that he was, is not in the history that we speak of, is not celebrated to the extent that he should be.

So tonight, I want to say to the family and friends, relatives, those who knew him, we celebrate him tonight. We celebrate the Honorable Charles Hamilton Houston tonight. We celebrate the Honorable Claudette Colvin

tonight. These are persons who were in the shadows but who made a difference, and giants stood on their shoulders.

Now to close. Let's go back to the Edmund Pettus Bridge because a significant thing occurred. At the Edmund Pettus Bridge when they marched across, at that time there were five African Americans in Congress; there were four Latino Americans in Congress, Hispanic Americans; and there were three Asian Pacific Islanders in Congress. Now, rather than five African Americans, we have 48. Rather than four Hispanic Members, we have 38. Rather than three Asian Pacific Americans, we have 14. I would also note that there were 14 females in Congress at that time. We now have 104.

Crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge provided the world an opportunity to see the horrors of invidious discrimination, of onerous segregation, the horrors that people, decent God-fearing human beings in the South, had to suffer. And it provided the President of the United States, the Honorable President from the State of Texas, Lyndon Johnson, the opportunity to sign the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

That Civil Rights Act is in no small part why I happen to stand before you in the Congress of the United States of America. I stand on the shoulders of many giants. Many of them are known to us, but there are a good many of them who are not known to us, and I am proud to say that during this time of Black History Month, it is appropriate for us to acknowledge them and celebrate them for what they have done to make it possible for many of us to have the opportunities that we have.

And today, as we look back and we revisit the Special Order hour, ''50 Years Ago From Selma: Where Are We and Where Are We Headed?,'' I must tell you, in concluding, that we are headed back to the future. We are headed back to the future because the Civil Rights Act of 1965, which accorded us the many opportunities that we have today, that Civil Rights Act of 1965, section 4 of it has been eviscerated. And as a result of the evisceration of section 4, we have seen, unfortunately, section 5 of the act lose its potency because without section 4, you don't have a section 5. Section 5 has been emasculated; section 4 eviscerated, section 5 emasculated. Section 5 is there, but it does not have the coverage areas that it is to address. And so without section 5, we find ourselves back to a point in time wherein we will have to again relitigate the whole question of the right to vote, to a certain extent—very limited—but also in this context the means by which we were able to secure many of the seats in Congress that the 48 Members presently enjoy.

So without that section 5, an effective, potent section 5, we find ourselves with a circumstance where we are looking back now to that future, that future that is going to require us to do some heavy lifting to reinstate section 4 of the Voting Rights Act.

And, as they marched once before, we will march once again this year. My hope is that we will be able to in this Congress come to a bipartisan conclusion that section 4 of the Voting Rights Act is still important to a good many people, and that we will work together to revitalize section 4 of the Voting Rights Act so as to give section 5 the potency it needs to provide the coverage that has been of great benefit to us.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to have had the opportunity to share these thoughts at this moment in time about some of the great heroes and heroines and some of the unsung heroes of the civil rights movement. I thank you, and I thank the leadership for allowing us this time to celebrate Black History Month in these, the great United States of America. God bless you, and God bless our great country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL CONVERSATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, first, if my friend, Congressman GREEN, wouldn't mind staying a moment, I would like to offer a few comments on what you said. Unfortunately, I missed the larger body of your talk, but I would like to add a few things, if you don't mind.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I welcome the opportunity to stand with you, my dear friend. Thank you.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I think it should be acknowledged that we were elected at the same time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. We are classmates.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. We are classmates. While we are on different sides of the political aisle, nonetheless I hope that you consider me as much of a friend as I consider you.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I do. And if I may say, I rarely think of sides of the aisle when you and I are talking. It doesn't become a significant factor in our lives as we converse and we celebrate our friendship.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I would like to note a couple of things you pointed out in your speech, and then you can move on with your evening. I don't want you to stay through my other comments, but nonetheless, you said a few things. You talked about the important progress that has been made in this country, and I think that is notable. You talked about that particularly difficult period in the 1960s, and you referred to Black History Month as America's history month as well. I think those are all notable comments, and I wanted to tell you that.

In that tough time, something happened to me that I would like to share with you. I was not born in the State that I represent. Nebraska is my home. It is where I have decided to raise my family. It has given me a bounty of opportunity, and I am so privileged to be a Representative from Nebraska. I was born in the Deep South in a State where segregation and racial difficulties were particularly difficult.

When I was in third grade, it was time for my birthday, and we had a birthday party and I invited all of my classmates. This was basically a White, middle class stable school in a stable neighborhood, but there was one African American family, either because of the beginning of desegregation that was taking place at that time or because they lived in proximity, they were at the school. One of the young boys was named Philip Brown. He was not only my classmate, but my friend. So I invited all of the boys, including Philip, to my birthday party. Philip didn't come. And I saw him on the Monday afterward and I asked him, I said: Philip, I didn't see you at my birthday party. Why didn't you come?

He said: I did. They wouldn't let me in.

Now this is an 8-year-old child.

I remember then thinking during the party, my father had come over to me and whispered in my ear, in terms of the time, he said: Jeffrey, is Philip a Black boy?

And I said: Yes, and I didn't think any more about it.

He had to go outside. My father had to go outside and talk to Philip's father because the establishment there, unbeknownst to us, but the establishment didn't let in African American children.

Now, I want to fast-forward, though. I told that story to my little children. I have five daughters, and they are growing up now, but I told this to them a few years ago. To your point about progress being made, they were visibly upset. They said: Daddy, you have to go find Philip. You have to go find him.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. What a wonderful thought.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Because they were deeply touched, wounded, if you will, by this story. How could this happen to a little child?

But I think you rightfully acknowledge that those days are behind us. And through all of the difficulties, toils and struggles that occurred, thankfully they are behind us. And I think what you said is appropriate, that Black History Month ought to also be called America's History Month because these chapters are an important, essential part of our national fabric and our national culture.

Again, I didn't intend to dialogue with you. But I was sitting there thinking of this, and I have never shared that story publicly. But I think the main part of the story is the painful look on my own little children's faces when they heard that, and I think that means good progress.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I appreciate you sharing that vignette with me because it is very much heartfelt. It is good to have a person to tell the actual story. If you have read it, you will know of what I speak; if you haven't, I commend it to you—Dr. King's ''Letter from a Birmingham Jail.''

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I am very familiar with it.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. It is one of the greatest pieces of literary history, saving a few holy books, I would say. It is absolutely one of the best stories of what that time was like. Dr. King talks about how he had to explain to his children why they couldn't go to a certain theme park, and how he could see the clouds over their heads as they were saddened by their inability to go to the theme park because of who they were.

I ask people to please read that letter because it really parallels what you are saying tonight here on the floor of the House of Representatives. You are right—we have come a long way from those times. These times are difficult in a different way, however. There is still great work to be done, and you and I can work together to get some of this additional great work done.

But notwithstanding all that I have said tonight, I conclude with this: On a bad day, it is still good to live in the USA.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Amen.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. On a bad day when your spouse wants to leave you, or on a bad day when your puppy wants to bite you, let your puppy bite you and let your spouse leave you, in the United States of America, on a bad day, it is still good to live in the USA.

□ 1800

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank you for listening to me and your commentary tonight. Let's continue our robust friendship and our collegiality as we work through differences and difficulties, which are inevitable in a body like this where there are indeed philosophical divides.

There ought to be certain principles that unite us, and I have myself quoted from Dr. King's letter in the Birmingham jail in other speeches.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you very much.

Mr. POE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank you for yielding. I won't take all of your time.

You and I, our careers have mirrored. We both became lawyers the same year, and we both started at the courthouse in Houston I think the same year—'73, '74, right in there.

Of course, you were on one side, the defendant side, and I was on the prosecution side. We worked before the same judges. You and I both became judges about the same time and then we left the bench at the same time and ran for Congress and joined Mr. FORTENBERRY in the infamous class of 2004 or '5.

I do want to make this comment that things at the courthouse during all that time changed a great deal as to who was at the courthouse in the courtroom representing either the State of Texas or the citizen accused, as you referred to him.

Were you the first African American to practice in the courtroom? Or was it Ned Wade or Ron Mock? Which one of you was it?

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I was not and probably someone prior to Ned Wade. There were other lawyers who were there long before us.

Mr. POE of Texas. It has changed a great deal. In fact, the judge who took my place is an African American judge at the courthouse in Houston. It is hard looking back on history to realize things were not always that way at the courthouse and the legal profession as they were in many other professions.

I think your accomplishments as an attorney and as a jurist are admirable. They have served the State of Texas quite well, but you fought a lot of battles during that time as well, and I want to thank you for fighting those battles.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Well, thank you.

I know that your time is of the essence, and you have been very generous with me, Mr. FORTENBERRY.

Will the gentleman allow one additional comment? The Honorable TED POE and I have had a friendship for many, many years. He is imminently correct. We were on different sides of the table, literally, in the courtroom, but we never allowed many of the political maneuvers of the time, the political issues of the time, to prevent us from being friends, and we brought that friendship to the Congress of the United States of America.

While there is still great work to be done—even in the courts, there is still great work to be done. There is great work to be done in the area of litigation that still is matriculating through the courts, but we still have to acknowledge that it is a better time to do it now than to do it then.

We have greater friendships and greater opportunities. On a bad day, it is still good to live in the USA.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. A great expression. Thank you.

Thank you, Judge POE.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I deviated, I had some other thoughts that I wanted to convey tonight. Mr. Speaker, let me start out with this thought.

It is a high goal, a principle, that I think across this body we all share, and it is this: Americans deserve a smart and effective government. I don't think nor do I think many of us believe that Washington should be mired in mediocrity, nor should we be divided by class or income, but I do think we have to acknowledge several difficult truths.

I think our national conversation should also start here. The reality is we have a tale of two very different economic recoveries. One recovery was working pretty well for transnational corporations, many of which are subsidized indirectly by the state, but the other recovery is not working quite as well for everyone else.

Too many families are facing downward mobility, stagnant wages, and an increased cost of living, and many feel abandoned by a Washington and Wall Street axis. There is an incomplete picture being given, I think, in the dynamics of the statistics that are now being promulgated about the current economy.

Yes, we have some good news. Energy prices have significantly fallen, and that is taking a lot of pressure off a lot of sectors and a lot of individuals. Some recovery is happening.

But as the head of the Gallup organization points out, the recent reports that the unemployment rate has dropped to 5.6 percent are really quite misleading. The Department of Labor doesn't count those who are trapped in unemployment and who have stopped looking.

In fact, the further you unpack these statistics and you look at what is causing the causal relationship here is, unfortunately, we are entering into a period of what I am calling an entrepreneurial winter, where there are more small businesses dying than there are being born; in other words, the net outcome of small business creation is in a negative range for the first time in the history of our country.

The reason this is significant is this is where most jobs come from. Most people in America are working hard and are looking for their opportunity in small business. We are not talking about larger entities, which have an important role in not only economic recovery and in creating employment for many, but small businesses are where the majority of jobs are created.

It is also where this dynamic of an interdependent economy, a healthy economy, is really born, an opportunity economy, where the benign forces of competition create a certain interdependency between the one who is making a good with their own two hands or their intellect and selling it to another who needs that good and, in turn, reinforcing a social dynamic that is essential to personal well-being and a healthy economy.

Well, how did we get into this position? I think we have to analyze this as well.

Mr. Speaker, I received a phone call last spring, and the gentleman was very, very eager to talk to me, so I called him back. In fact, he was so eager to talk to me that he was actually sitting at the Nebraska spring football game where the white team versus the red team, they play it out.

This is a big deal in Nebraska. Tens of thousands of people actually go to this game. He was sitting in the stands, and he took his time out from watching the Nebraska spring game to talk to me which is a high honor.

He wanted to point out that he was a small business person. He owned and started a heating and air-conditioning business and, until very recently, had five employees. Because he could see what was coming—particularly in health care—he got rid of all of his jobs, and it is just him now.

If you ask the question—and analytics are showing this—as to why small businesses are not taking proper risk going out into the marketplace to create new products and hire people, there are two simple—this is a bit simplistic—but two answers are what come forward. The first is health care, and the second is regulation.

You see, in the name of trying to create an orderly and just and fair economy when Washington overreaches and creates an environment that is setting up the guardrails for proper economic function, if it is too heavyhanded and it is penalizing those who don't have an army of lawyers and accountants and regulatory personnel, that means that the playing field suddenly shifts toward much bigger entities that, in many ways, can become impersonal.

The more Washington imposes regulatory burdens that are affecting the outlook and expectation of small business people, the more they are hesitating to hire.

The second factor is health care. Now, I think we have to have this hard conversation. We have a broken health care law. The Affordable Care Act, as it is called, could be called now the ''Unaffordable Care Act.''

The law was designed to fix some real cracks in our system that were very evident. People with preexisting conditions or people being priced out of the market were having a very difficult time finding health insurance, and that needs to be addressed, and it needs to be addressed through Washington policy.

But we need a health care system that is focused on decreasing cost and improving health care outcomes while also helping vulnerable persons. What we have gotten now is higher escalating cost, fewer choices, and a dampening effect on the entrepreneurial small business economy—again, where most jobs come from. It is not me saying this. This is what the statistics are bearing out and the research is bearing out; and it is a hard, hard reality.

Instead of just saying ''no'' to the Affordable Care Act, those of us who have said ''no'' many times also have a responsibility to find a responsible replacement in public policy for us—again, one that is going to increase competition, improve health care outcomes, give additional choice, while also decreasing cost, and protecting vulnerable persons.

Mr. Speaker, I think Americans deserve the best possible health care outcomes in the world. The question is how do we get there?

Well, from my perspective, a new framework, a new architecture of approach is needed, but it basically expands a policy that we already have.

A long time ago, I had a very significant headache. I was in my twenties. I carried my own health care policy, and it was very expensive, so I had a very high deductible.

Because the headache was particularly severe, I decided: Well, I assume the family physician will probably just send me on to a specialist.

So I called the ear, nose, and throat specialist directly and went and got an appointment. She did an x ray and said: I can't really tell from the x ray, so I am going to have to do a CAT scan.

I said: Doctor, is that really necessary? You know, I understand the problem of liability and the need to push the boundaries on testing. Is it really necessary?

She asked me directly, almost kind of indignant, she said: Why are you talking to me about this? I said: Because I am paying for this. My deductible is very, very high. I am actually paying the cost of this test. I just want to know if this is absolutely necessary. Help me to make that decision.

She said: Oh, yes, of course, it is necessary. But now that you said that, I am just looking at your sinuses, so why don't we call places in town that have the machine and see if they will widen the cross section and give you a discount? I said: Great.

In 3 minutes, she had her assistant call. We found a place in town that was about $75 cheaper than normal. The doctor got the test that she needed. Perhaps most importantly, in the aggregate, the resource was more properly allocated, all because I had the incentive to ask a simple question because I was actually paying for the test.

Now, we have a policy that encourages health savings accounts. Some Americans have them; some Americans don't. They are not appropriate for every American, particularly Americans who are getting older and at the ending point of their professional careers, because health savings accounts coupled with catastrophic insurance are a very, very proper way, I think, to manage health care when you are younger and in middle life. We ought to be expanding this.

The second point is: How do we get there? Guaranteed access to affordable, quality catastrophic health insurance with health savings accounts.

What you get for that is you are protected. If something really goes wrong, if you are in the hospital in the emergency, you shouldn't be put in the position of asking: Who is the chief anesthesiologist around here? I need to compare prices.

No, in those scenarios, you are protected. But in ordinary health care decisions, in partnership with your doctor—health care provider—making prudential decisions about what is really necessary and what is not, I think this is a mechanism by which we can again significantly empower families to save money, control their first health care dollar cost, and be protected at the same time.

The health savings account is a tax-preferred vehicle whereby money is set aside on a tax-preferred basis and accumulates over time. Now, most people in their lifetimes don't get significantly sick, so there is the opportunity here again for young people to begin to set aside money in this tax-deferred account that actually helps them pay for when ordinary medical expenses arise. Then again, if something really goes wrong, you have catastrophic insurance.

Over time, these accounts would become larger and larger and help supplement retirement, help supplement the Medicare system, strengthening those important retirement security programs.

□ 1815

I think this is a key to reworking our current health care model, not for everyone, but an expansion of this opportunity, I think, is the right architecture in moving forward for the next generation, particularly, so that we guarantee access to affordable, quality health care.

I think we carry forward some important provisions in that no one with a preexisting condition can be denied. I think the provision whereby children can stay on their parents' health care longer, now until age 26—I actually supported that before the new health care law—is smart policy. We remove caps on insurance, but that doesn't save any money. It just penalizes those who get really sick. We carry those provisions forward, again, to protect persons in a vulnerable circumstance, but we give everyone the access to affordable, quality health insurance.

There is a lot of detail that would go into how you would make that happen—whether or not you would spread that cost over the entire market through regulation or whether you would subsidize it like the government does in other insurance markets, like flood insurance and crop insurance. Nonetheless, I think that is the right framework and architecture for a robust, competitive health insurance marketplace that is going to improve health outcomes, reduce costs, and protect vulnerable persons.

What will we get if we do this? What will we get if we are courageous enough as a body to step forward and say, ''Do you know what? We can do better. Americans deserve better than the current arrangement''?

We will get peace of mind for ourselves and for our doctors. I think this would go a long way toward helping resolve the underlying problem here of stagnation in the economy, particularly among those who want to be entrepreneurs—small business persons

who are creating jobs, those who have a gift or an idea and who want to take a little risk but who now aren't empowered to do so because of the environment that has been created that has dampened their ability to seize this opportunity. This would be the key to unlocking a healthy economy, one that is focused on opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE STALKING GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, this Chamber was filled with Members of the House of Representatives, and all of us stood up and raised our right hands, and we took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. It is the same oath the President takes and that others take—the military. We do that for a lot of reasons, but the main reason is that, in this country, the Constitution is paramount to all other law. I agree with that philosophy. The Constitution, I think, is a marvelously written document, as well as the Declaration of Independence, which justified the reason for us to start our own country.

Attached to the Constitution is what is commonly referred to as the Bill of Rights—rights to the people and prohibitions against government intruding on those rights. They call it the ''Bill of Rights.'' There were originally 12, and 10 of them passed. That is why we have 10 instead of 12 under the Bill of Rights. I would like to start and talk about only one of those rights. Since there are only 30 minutes, I am going to talk only about one of those, and it is the Fourth Amendment. Let's go through it together, Mr. Speaker.

The Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

''The right of the people''—that is us—''to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated''—that sounds pretty absolute to me—''and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.''

Now, you don't have to be a legal scholar or a lawyer to understand what this is talking about. It is the right of privacy—that government could go into our homes and our effects and our things and our stuff. It generally cannot do that except under circumstances which require that they go get a warrant.

I used to be a judge. Judge GREEN, who was just in here a while ago, used to be a judge. What that means is the police, generally, go to the judge and say: ''Judge''—in a written document with the affidavit that they swear to—''the affidavit states we believe—I believe—that there are,'' let's say, ''drugs—cocaine specifically—in Bobby Oglethorpe's home.'' Bobby Oglethorpe is a notorious Texas outlaw, so I am going to use him as the one. It describes what they are looking for. They say where it is, and they give the address of where Bobby Oglethorpe lives in Houston. Then I read it to see if it states probable cause.

What does that mean? There are a lot of definitions to it, but, basically, the statement proves, with the affidavit of the peace officer, that there is probable cause to believe that that item is where the police officer says it is, and is drugs, so that would be illegal.

The judge signs the warrant. What that does is it orders the police officer to go to that specific location in a certain timeframe. You can't do it, like, forever. You don't have 6 months to go look for it. It is usually 3 days. You go over there, and you search that address, looking for that specific stuff—cocaine, drugs—that is in the possession of Bobby Oglethorpe. Then the police officer normally would leave a document with the person at the house as to what they seized.

The officer comes back to the judge and says: ''Judge, I executed the warrant you gave me to Bobby Oglethorpe's house, and I brought you back the return on the warrant—what I seized—because I was ordered to go get it.'' Then he files the return in the court with the clerk, and that varies from State to State.

Basically, the concept is, before government goes into your house or other things, an independent person—a judge—has got to separate the law—the police—from the citizen and make an independent decision as to whether or not what they are looking for is where it is, or they have not established probable cause. Now, that is a generalization of the whole concept of a warrant.

Why do we even have these things? It goes back to our history, our American history. Everything seems to be based on history, and it is good that we reflect on it.

Back in 1761, America was not a country, it was a colony, made up of 13 Colonies. At that particular time—this is not a new thing about warrants, this is not a new thing—British subjects who lived in England, specifically, had the right to have what was called a ''specific warrant'' issued against them before they would have to give up the item, as opposed to what I will show you as being a general warrant.

Generally speaking, before a magistrate in England would allow some British subject's home to be searched, the peace officer would have to go to a magistrate and show some specificity as to where the document or the item was, with some type of probable cause, but in coming to the Colonies, that was not true. English magistrates who ruled over the Colonies did not give colonists the same protection as other British subjects back in England. So what would occur is this:

Those colonists, it has been said, were hiding rum, rum that had been brought into the United States—the Colonies—and other things, and they had not paid the tax on the rum. So the British would go to a magistrate and say: ''Give us a general warrant to go search,'' let's say, ''Bobby Oglethorpe's great, great, great-grandfather. We will search his warehouse to find any items that may not have been stamped with the appropriate tax.''

The colonists didn't like that. That is a general warrant. You have got a piece of paper from a magistrate, saying, ''Ah, go over there, and look around. See if you can find something that is illegally in the possession of colonists without the Stamp Act on there.'' These were called ''writs of assistance.'' They were called ''general warrants.'' They are pretty much the same thing. I won't go into the difference of those two individuals.

With the colonists being the type of folks they were in Massachusetts, they took them to court. They took the British Crown to court. Their lawyer was James Otis, and he protested in a courtroom, saying, ''Your warrant is not specific enough. It is too general.'' The British judge, magistrate, ruled against the colonists, and there were several businessmen who were being sued in this case.

Now, that may not seem like a big deal, but John Adams, who later became President of the United States, observed all of this, and he said that act was the spark which originated the American Revolution. What is that? It is the act of government invading the privacy of the colonists. He said that sparked the American Revolution, what we now call the ''Fourth Amendment,'' because the colonists weren't protected from unreasonable searches and seizures. They weren't protected from specific warrants saying specifically what they were looking for in a specific place based on probable cause. The local magistrate would just write out a document, saying, ''Go over there and look at this warehouse, and see if you find any,'' in this case, ''rum that doesn't have the stamp, that doesn't have a tax on there.''

Our history shows that this is an important concept. Now, what does it require?

It requires a specific warrant as opposed to a general warrant. It requires that it be specific as to what you are looking for. It has got to be based upon probable cause. It just doesn't give the police the authority to go into someone's home and look around and see if you find some contraband. You have got to have it based upon probable cause, sworn to, and it is limited in scope, as required under the Fourth Amendment, which we will read again if we have enough time.

The right of privacy was important to our ancestors—it is in the Fourth Amendment—and it is important to

Americans today. We are a little unique on this right of privacy. It is really not one of the things that a lot of other countries have. Remember, it is not supposed to be violated by government, our right to be secure in our homes and in our effects.

So here we are in 2015, and where are we?

This morning, somewhere in the United States, somebody woke up and sent out some emails and made a phone call. A person may have had a meeting, so he got his little iPhone out—5 or 6 or whatever it is—and pulled up Google maps to figure out a route to get from where he was to where the meeting was. He took his vehicle or maybe jumped in a cab and checked Facebook if he were in a cab, on the phone, texted his friend, and maybe even played what is now something fun, I guess, for some people—''Candy Crush''—on the iPhone.

After the meeting is over with, this individual may head off to the office, log onto the computer, do a little G-chatting with a friend about where he planned to go for dinner that evening, and later that evening, he uploads a photograph from supper, as we call it in Texas, on his Instagram. That is, maybe, a typical day for a lot of people.

But, all during that route of the American citizen's, the Federal Government has the ability to stalk that individual every step of the way because of the devices that he is using electronically. Maybe, until last year—until some news came out by the national media—most Americans were unaware that their every move could be tracked by Big Brother. Through the NSA, which I call the ''National Spy Agency'' now, the government has the ability to read citizens' emails, to read their texts, to know their phone logs, to track the location and travel and movements of citizens, to snoop and collect information about individuals through smartphones, apps, to read G-chats, and to look at private photographs—all unknown to the citizen.

The failure to disclose any of this information until recently is why many Americans now fear government intrusion—I call it government stalking—into our lives. The stalking government has kept its Peeping Tom activities a big secret until, primarily, Edward Snowden told us all about it.

□ 1830

His issue is a different issue, but now we know about it.

So how did we get here? Over the years, technology has rapidly changed and given power-hungry—my opinion—bureaucrats the capability to sift through data and find out more information than ever. Just because they have the physical ability doesn't mean that they have the constitutional right or any right to violate the Fourth Amendment because this protects Americans. The Fourth Amendment doesn't protect government; it protects Americans. It protects citizens.

The government seems to justify the snooping, the Peeping Tom for a couple of reasons. The White House, the administration claims that NSA has no interest in monitoring American citizens; they are just looking for bad guys. Well, I have a hard time believing that. Until evidence came out to the contrary, the NSA, it seems, was snooping and spying on lots of Americans in the name of trying to catch the bad guys.

Furthermore, NSA, when they did a little investigation, they found dozens of instances where their own employees misused intelligence capabilities to spy on people—ex-girlfriends and others. Why? Simply because they had the ability.

So we have learned for years that the NSA has quietly, in my opinion, snooped and spied on millions of Americans without a warrant—and that is the key—and without their knowledge and without their consent. This is justified for a second reason, based upon the name of national security. It is said we live in terrible times. We do. We have got these terrorists running all over the world, bad guys trying to hurt us, so we at the NSA need to get this information to protect Americans from these bad guys.

Well, let's analyze that just for a moment if we can.

We have heard reports that, well, we have caught a lot of bad guys because of this information that NSA has seized, this megadata. So during a Committee on the Judiciary hearing last year, I asked Deputy Attorney General James Cole this question: How many criminal cases have been filed based upon this massive seizure of information by NSA, collecting information on Americans without the use of a warrant and storing it? And to my knowledge it still exists. How many criminal cases?

He testified: Maybe one. Maybe one.

So this nonsense about we are doing all of this because we have to catch the bad guys, they have got one criminal case that they can talk about. Even if there were more, it does not justify, in my opinion, the massive seizure of data without constitutional safeguards.

Let's read it one more time. ''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue''—in this case no warrants at all are issuing—''but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.''

That is not what is occurring. It is just massive amounts of information are being seized.

Let me try to describe it this way. Let's go back to Bobby Oglethorpe. Let's say that Bobby Oglethorpe lives close to where I do in Atascocita, Texas, and the police come to me as a judge and say: Judge, we know that Bobby Oglethorpe lives in this ZIP Code here, but we don't know where he lives, and he is no good. He is a criminal, and he is in possession of firearms and drugs, and all kinds of illegal things he has done, but we don't know which house he is in in this particular ZIP Code, so we want to go search all the houses in the ZIP Code and hopefully we will catch him.

No judge in this country would sign a warrant and say: All right. Have at it. Start searching all the houses looking for this one guy with all this bad illegal stuff that he is in possession of.

No judge would do that. Why? Because it violates the Fourth Amendment. Why? Because it is not specific enough. It is a general warrant, like the British were imposing on the Colonies that, as John Adams said, sparked the American Revolution. Wouldn't do that.

Or another example, it is like finding a needle in a haystack. The government wants to seize the whole haystack. They can't do that. They have got to find the needle. They have got to be specific in their warrant. So, in my opinion, based upon the Fourth Amendment, the activity of the NSA, by seizing lots of data, violates the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution.

There are other examples.

So we talked about NSA seizure of data, and to my knowledge, like I said, they still store all this information.

May I inquire of the Speaker how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you. I appreciate it.

NSA. Let's move on to what is called ECPA. We will talk about the IRS a little bit.

This spring, most Americans are going to be filing taxes, their tax returns, and many Americans, including me, are concerned about the IRS' ability to take information from Americans without their consent or without a warrant. Sometimes that includes emails. So let's talk specifically about the concept of government seizure of emails without consent of the person who sent it or received it and without a warrant.

Current Federal law is that, if somebody has an email within 6 months of when that email was sent, that email, to be obtained by government—not just law enforcement, but any government agency—they have to get a warrant to seize that. But as soon as that 160 days runs, past 160 days, the government doesn't get a warrant because the law doesn't require it. I think in the spirit of the Fourth Amendment, the Fourth Amendment should require that.

Email, what is email? That is an electronic message sent to another person.

Let's go back to regular mail or snail mail, which some people call it. If I write a letter and I seal the envelope and I put the postage on there and I

send it, go put it in the mailbox, one of those blue mailboxes, and I drop that in the mailbox, the government does not have the authority to go in that mailbox and take the letter out, read the letter, seize the letter without a warrant.

So it flows through the United States postal system from wherever to wherever, and it lands in somebody else's mailbox. That mail, generally speaking, is protected under the Fourth Amendment, because it violates the Fourth Amendment if government seizes it and goes into the contents without a warrant.

The same should apply to emails. It is communication. It is just done electronically. But the law does not allow—let me say it another way. If emails are over 6 months old, Americans should be aware of the fact that government may seize those emails from a private company without your knowledge, without your consent, and without a warrant.

That is why I have introduced, along with Representative ZOE LOFGREN from California, that the law should be that emails are protected, that it is a right of privacy and it is an expectation of privacy for Americans that emails be protected and that government should be getting a warrant before they seize those documents, because it is a violation at least in the spirit of the Fourth Amendment. I hope that that legislation does finally come to the floor and we get a vote on protecting the Fourth Amendment, the right of privacy for Americans when it comes to emails.

The same applies not only just to emails, but under the circumstances, it would apply to geolocation devices that the government knows where you are. I think the government, to keep up with you, needs a warrant to stalk you throughout the United States.

The third thing I wanted to mention in the remaining time is a completely different issue, but it has to do with drones, the right of privacy. We are in the drone age. It is estimated that by 2030 we will have 30,000 drones over the skies of the United States, 30,000 of them.

Drones are a marvelous invention. They are highly technical. They can be very small. You can get one at a local store that you can put in the palm of your hand. No question about it, there are good uses for drones. Right now the law is that the FAA regulates the use of drones throughout the United States. It may permit some; it may not permit, may refuse to permit them. It is a bureaucratic decision by the FAA.

Congress needs to weigh in on the issue of drones and set down constitutional guidelines. People need to know the rules. Law enforcement needs to know the rules, and private citizens need to know the rules about their use of drones. And basically, the Fourth Amendment ought to apply to the use of a drone except with the exigent circumstances that already apply to the Fourth Amendment—high-speed chases, disasters, fires, et cetera—but we need some guidelines on the issue of drones.

Congress has the responsibility to protect the Fourth Amendment of the surveillance of Americans by either law enforcement or by private citizens and develop a standard for both law enforcement and for private citizens to know what the standard is. Yes, there are reasons why we should use them, and the law should allow those, but Congress needs to make the decision, not the FAA.

I have a local sheriff, or the sheriff in Texas where I am from. He generally says he doesn't want to use drones because he doesn't know what the courts are going to decide down the road as to whether or not that use of a drone was a lawful or unlawful violation of the Fourth Amendment. So rather than wait for the courts to decide if this specific use is or is not a violation of the Fourth Amendment, Congress needs to come up with guidelines about the design and the protection of the Fourth Amendment that drones can only be used in certain circumstances; otherwise, they are not allowed to be used because they violate the Fourth Amendment of the United States.

So those are three issues that have the right of privacy that are being, I think, chilled today because there is more and more government intrusion into all of those areas: into the massive data of phone information, information that is put on your iPhone, for example, that is being seized, can be seized without knowledge, without warrant; the massive amount of emails that can be seized—we really don't know how much is being seized because over 6 months your personal email is not protected by law; government agencies, not just law enforcement, can seize that—and then the skies will have 30,000 of those drones.

There needs to be some regulations within protection of the Fourth Amendment, and we need to work with industry and government to outline what those rules ought to be to protect the Fourth Amendment, protect the right of privacy of individuals to be secure in their homes, in their papers, and their effects from government intervention and government intrusion. Congress should set the standard for what a reasonable expectation of privacy is, especially in those areas that I mentioned and the one regarding drones as well.

So I hope that we see some movement in this legislation. Once again, ZOE LOFGREN and I have introduced legislation, as well as others, to protect the right of individuals to be free from searches of their emails after 6 months without a search warrant. We have that legislation pending as well. Hopefully, we can rein in what I call the stalking government about stalking American citizens.

America is not about keeping up and following every citizen in the United States by government. That is what other countries do. That is what countries like the Soviet Union used to do. That is not what America should be doing, and Congress needs to weigh in on this to protect individuals' right of privacy under the Fourth Amendment, which was the spark, according to John Adams, to the American Revolution, that concept of the Fourth Amendment being violated.

And that is just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 30 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman very much for the yielded time, and I thank the floor staff and the representatives of the Democratic cloakroom, Republican cloakroom for their courtesies.

I want to join my good friend who was on the floor earlier this evening. I was detained in a diplomatic meeting. I could not join my good friend, Congressman AL GREEN, as he began to commemorate and salute Black History Month.

□ 1845

This is story of a proud people, of Americans who participated in every historic event since the founding of this country and whose ancestors proudly wore the uniform on many occasions, including the uniform in the Civil War and wars beyond.

Tonight, I come to salute both national heroes and local heroes from Houston, Texas, and—in particular—the 18th Congressional District.

This, in fact, is the 39th commemoration of Black History Month, and we celebrate the contributions of African Americans who have contributed to the history and the greatness of our Nation.

We pay tribute to trailblazers, pioneers, and leaders, like many of us know, such as Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall; United States Senator Blanche Kelso Bruce; a U.S. Congresswoman from my congressional district, the Honorable Barbara Jordan, who most recently sat amongst us, retiring from the United States Congress in 1978–79; U.S. Congressman Mickey Leland, who lost his life trying to provide food to hungry people in Ethiopia; astronauts like Dr. Guion Stewart Bluford, Jr., and Mae C. Jemison; Frederick Douglass; Booker T. Washington; James Baldwin; Harriet Tubman; Rosa Parks; Maya Angelou, who taught me at Yale University; Toni Morrison, a premier writer; along with another outstanding writer as well, Gwendolyn Brooks—just to name a few of the countless well-known and unsung heroes whose contributions have helped our Nation become a more perfect union.

The history of the United States has been marked by the great contributions of African American activists, leaders, writers, and artists. As a Member of Congress, I stand on those shoulders.

Their struggles and triumphs made it possible for me to stand here today and continue to fight for their values and really the values embedded in what America is all about: the values of equality and justice, progress for all, regardless of race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation.

Mr. Speaker, I have two very special giants. They are my mother and father. Mrs. Ivalita ''Ivy'' Jackson, a vocational nurse, and Mr. Ezra C. Jackson, one of the first African Americans who was welcomed for a short period of time into the growing comic book publishing business during World War II.

That was the entertainment. Many Americans found stories of joy, drama, various superheroes, monsters, and a number of other things in the comic book business.

In New York City, a young man by the name of Ezra Jackson was given the door as the youngest son of my grandmother, Olive Jackson, who had sent three sons off to World War II. My uncles each fought. The youngest son was to stay with his widow mother. In doing so, he found in himself a talent.

Even today, I am very proud to say that his works have been shown in the Smithsonian. He is just an individual, one might say average man—an African American man—who suffered the indignities of discrimination and later found no place in that industry as he was being replaced by White citizens.

I know that their strength—a mother in her tenacity and longstanding work at Booth Memorial Hospital—was the foundation for myself and my brother Michael Jackson and now with many who have come behind. They were beloved parents, and they taught me the value of education, hard work, discipline, perseverance, and caring for others.

I know this is not family night, but I cite my husband, Dr. Elwyn Lee. He became the first tenured African American professor at the University of Houston School of Law.

There are many today that make their pathway standing on the shoulders of others. The most wonderful tribute that I like is to our military veterans who, as I indicated when I started, have fought in every war since the Revolutionary War—how amazing.

These people came first in the bottom of a belly of a slave boat as slaves. They can count their history to every single war, fighting on behalf of the sanctity and the security of our Nation.

I remember joining Congressman JOHN LEWIS and Congressman CHARLES RANGEL, a Korean war veteran, as we were invited to pay tribute to the Tuskegee Airmen and the 555th Parachute Infantry Battalion, the famed ''Triple Nickels.''

I was honored to be able to be at that ceremony sponsored by the U.S. Army commemorating the 50th anniversary of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Everything that we have gained has been because our soldiers, regardless of their race, religion, or background, were able to put on the uniform. I am very grateful to say that so many of those who put on the uniform, even when they were treated in an unfair manner in this country, proudly put on that uniform and fought for the Nation.

I am reminded of all of them, Mr. Speaker, because they live amongst us in our communities, and as we have seen in the honoring of the Devils yesterday, we see that they are so proud to wear their uniform. They have fought so hard.

Let me salute all of our veterans and soldiers, and let me be reminded of those from the African American community who went to serve, even as the laws of this Nation did not treat them fairly.

I am well aware of the Tuskegee Airmen because my father-in-law was a Tuskegee Airman, along with his wife, who was one of the supporters. Phillip Ferguson Lee and Ethiopia Lee, now 94 years old, received a Congressional Gold Medal.

Of course, we know the story of the Tuskegee Airmen achieving one of the lowest loss records of all the escort fighter groups and being in constant demand for their services by the Allied bomber units, a record unmatched by any other fighter group.

You know something, Mr. Speaker? These brave men and women, no matter—as I indicated—what race, it is so interesting. They do not tell their story often. That is why I am so glad that the United States Congress over these last years has begun to honor all of these groups so that their story can be told and forever embedded in the history of this Nation.

I want to go on to say that the impressive feats of the Tuskegee Airmen were outstanding and astounding. I believe that their efforts and much of the success of African American soldiers in World War II caused, in 1948, to persuade President Harry Truman to issue his famous Executive Order—which I am so glad he issued—No. 9981, which directed equality of treatment and opportunity in all of the United States Armed Forces and led to the end of racial segregation in the United States military forces.

One person to tell that story in the eloquent way that it has been told is General Colin Powell—or the famous Davis generals, ''Chappie'' Davis was who was one and well known—but Colin Powell tells that story.

Clearly, these individuals bravely fought for their country, but they show that they had the right stuff. They are American history, and they certainly are a testament to Black history.

Clearly, what began as an experiment to determine whether ''colored'' soldiers were capable of operating expensive and complex aircraft ended as an unqualified success, based on the experience of the Tuskegee Airmen, whose record included 261 enemy aircraft destroyed, 148 aircraft of the enemy damaged, 15,553 combat sorties, and 1,578 missions over Italy and north Africa.

They also destroyed or damaged over 950 units of ground transportation and escorted more than 200 bombing missions. They proved that ''the antidote to racism is excellence in performance,'' as retired Lieutenant Colonel Herbert Carter once remarked.

I take joy in this presentation and sharing this with my colleagues. It is Black History Month, but sometimes, we need to remember to say thank you to all Americans who have gone on before us. This month, we happen to be focusing on African Americans.

Who can forget United States Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm and the strong voice that she was for the vulnerable? A lady from Brooklyn, her first appointment in this Congress was to the Agriculture Committee. No, she didn't run away from it. She ran toward it. Her famous statement is: ''A tree grows in Brooklyn.'' She ran for President. She made history there.

There are others like Harriet Tubman—we call her General Moses—who led slaves to freedom up and down the east coast. She had a sharp tongue and told anybody that was lagging behind: You aren't going to stay behind because, if you did and got caught, all my others who are trying to escape would be captured.

Certainly, Rosa Parks, who was a proud American, had the great fortitude—although a small woman who did tailoring work—to indicate in a way that subjected herself to being put in prison, put in jail, is that: I, too, am an American.

I am so glad that Mae Jemison lives in my community. I obviously represent the city that loves NASA and loves human space exploration. Mae Jemison, the first African American woman to go into space, now has dedicated herself to exposing young people to math, science, engineering, technology, and creating more astronauts for the restored and reinvigorated human space exploration. That is a good thing. That is a very good thing.

I believe we can look to work together in the 50th year of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I am a member of the United States Congress and the Judiciary Committee, led by a man who made history himself at that time, JOHN CONYERS, who has served in many capacities but has been a chair of the Judiciary Committee, being the first African American to ever chair that committee, but also a man that at every cornerstone of justice has a fight, whether it is sentencing, whether it is prison reform, whether it is dealing with the issues of copyright, whether it is the social justice issues.

Let me say he was the first employer of Rosa Parks outside of her town of

Alabama where she made her historic stand in Montgomery, Alabama. She worked for Congressman JOHN CONYERS.

I mentioned this is the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. We all know the story. I knew the story beforehand. I worked for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Right after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, I knew the names of Hosea Williams and James Orange and Ambassador Andrew Young as those who worked closely with Dr. King. Certainly, Reverend Jesse Jackson had moved up to Operation PUSH.

I say that to say that we know the story that it was the throngs of unnamed persons who pursued a simple right: the right to vote. I believe their heroic efforts have made it part of America's history.

I always believed one vote, one person is not for me. It is not for whether you are White or Hispanic or Asian or African American. It is for America. I truly believe that they made the first step to tell America that a vote should be unfettered for every citizen.

You should not be blocked from voting—and I hope, Mr. Speaker, we will get to that point—not selfishly for one group versus another, but I hope we will get to that point for all of America.

I think in this month of Black history commemoration, I need to give a challenge. That challenge needs to be that we need to pass the Voting Rights Act reauthorization as was crafted in the last Congress and supported by bipartisan Members.

I had the privilege to be one of the original cosponsors. Former Congressman Spencer Bachus was on that bill with me. We had seen each other and marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. He was, of course, a Representative from Alabama. There was no forcing, no pushing.

It was just quiet thought that this was the right thing to do by a number of Republican Members who supported that legislation in the last Congress, including one of the esteemed former chairmen of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

□ 1900

But it was all about thinking that it is important not to block anyone from voting. I still think that that is the right thing. I think the premise is right. I think it is premised on the Constitution.

There is no statement about voting in the Constitution, but there are statements of philosophy and rights and liberties, all driven by someone's right to vote for a government that will promote religious freedom, freedom of access, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, the right to a trial by jury, due process.

Certainly, we know the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were all geared toward the idea of freedom. And you can only secure freedom, one, by your wonderful men and women who are willing to stand in uniform and fight for us, many who have gone through the ages and shed their blood.

But the other is an active and involved and participatory civic society, and the actions of a civic society are their voice and their votes.

I plead with my colleagues, let us make the vote and the voice real by supporting the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, written to respond to the United States Supreme Court.

I may have disagreed with the Supreme Court's position on section 5, but, Mr. Speaker, I have a basic internal mechanism that says you adhere to the law. You follow the law. You follow the dictates of the courts as they reach their final answer in the highest Court of the land.

So we went to working on a structure that, in fact, was not pointed but broad, meaning that you would not point out certain States, you would just say that you couldn't violate a person's right to vote.

And the good news is, you had the ability to work yourself out of the coverage of that act. That is a good thing—work yourself out.

Then, if a State—though I don't think it might happen with the diverse States that we have—wants to work its way in, we find a way to correct their laws that might be blocking someone's right to vote. I am going to have the confidence that we are going to take that up and make a difference in the lives of all Americans.

Let me move on to say that I hope my challenge will be accepted, and I hope that we will take the words of Dr. King. I enjoy reading his writings. He was more than, if you will, the civil rights leader. He was a man who thoughtfully crafted words and messages to inspire and give us a road map.

He had these famous words, ''Why We Can't Wait,'' which were found in the 1960s. What a provocative statement. Is he trying to provoke people to violence? Absolutely not.

He was a committed, dedicated servant and disciple of Gandhi's nonviolence, and his own internal mechanism of nonviolence. It was in his DNA. He would not provoke any form of violence.

We should know that because, as the story looks back and things happened, if you were part of the SCLC, they were driven, they trained all of their foot soldiers in an absolute commitment to nonviolence. And if you showed any sign that you could not adhere, you would not be part of their efforts.

Dr. King had some famous words that I like. I know and like many of his words, but this one: ''Everybody can be great or anybody can serve. You only need a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love.''

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, it is important when you come up and talk about great people, that you don't forget home. And I just want to acknowledge some of the great leaders in my community. I can't call all their names, but I do want to acknowledge Reverend F.N. Williams, Sr., one of the founding pastors of the Antioch Missionary Baptist Church. His father was almost the founding father of Acres Homes, one of the great leaders in the 1920s and 30s, and he has carried on his civil rights legacy.

Dr. S.J. Gilbert, Sr., who led the Mount Sinai Baptist Church.

Reverend Crawford W. Kimble, who was the pastor of Barbara Jordan, an erudite man that wrote beautiful words of leadership and challenge.

The late Reverend E. Stanley Branch, in essence, a Republican, who was a leader who brought all people together.

Reverend Dr. William A. Lawson, the founder of the Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church, who walked with Dr. King and is the go-to person on issues of, again, marching and fighting nonviolently for justice.

Reverend Johnny Robeson, who was a great leader of the Baptist Ministers Association. And I remember him distinctly not indicating what politics or party it was, but is it right, is it just?

Commissioner El Franco Lee is the first African American Commissioner on the Harris County Commissioners.

Mr. John Bland, one of the Texas Southern University students who marched to desegregate the various lunch counters.

Ms. Ruby Mosley, up in age, who is a fighter for senior citizens and is a mother of Acres Homes.

Ms. Dorothy Hubbard, the late Dorothy Hubbard, who, in fact, worked in my office and instructed me about how you serve and help people.

Ms. Doris Hubbard, one of the first young persons to be active in the Texas Democratic Party and who has been a champion for equality and justice.

Willie Bell Boone, another one who minces no words about fighting to make sure that everyone's voice is heard.

Holly HogoBrooks, who, again, is a great leader as it relates to the civil rights movement and the marching on the counters.

Mr. Deloyd Parker founded this great organization called Shape, that has lifted the boats of inner city children, one by one. And out of that Shape Community Center have come doctors and lawyers, have come scientists and businesspersons. But they all have a heart for service.

''Doll'' Carter, Ms. Lenora Carter, with her husband, was the founder of the Forward Times, I believe, the oldest newspaper.

So you can see that Black history is a storytelling history.

And so, as I close my remarks, I have to take a moment of personal privilege to be able to talk about something that I have enjoyed.

You see, Mr. Speaker, around this time of year, in Houston, we have something called the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo. It is eons and

decades of years old. It goes back to our traditions as cowboys and cowgirls, and we are not going to let it go.

So every year—we are coming up on it—it is probably going to go for, we say, almost two months that we are legitimately in our cowboy, cowgirl attire.

I was privileged to be honored by the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo Black Heritage Committee, which I helped found 20-some years ago because I knew that the Black cowboys and others wanted to be so much a part of it.

I want to pay tribute to Verna Lee ''Boots'' Booker, who was the first cowgirl, if you will, to be in the Houston rodeo. And I received that award. What a privilege to acknowledge that we are everywhere. She was a competitor, and I believe it was in the barrel competition. But what an exciting night to recall her history.

So we are going to be rodeoing over the next couple of weeks, and I want to pay tribute to all of the trail riders, and particularly, those of African American heritage. They have carried on this tradition.

I want to make mention, I know there are many others, but allow me to make mention of the Prairie View Trail Ride Association, which makes its annual trek to the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo in Hempstead. They rendezvous with a dozen other caravans at Memorial Park and they join the rodeo.

Mr. Speaker, they stay out on the trail. This is real. They don't get into a hotel and then get on their horses. They ride that trail for 2 and 3 and 4 weeks, and then come down to the rodeo on the day of the big rodeo parade.

The Prairie View Trail Ride was founded in 1957 by James Francies, Jr., Dr. Alfred N. Poindexter, and Myrtis Dightman. I know there are others, but these are those who started.

Their mission was to promote agricultural interest in young Americans and to perpetuate those principles and methods which have come to be regarded as the ideals and traditions of the Western World as well as the Negro Western Heritage.

I am glad that they wanted to perpetuate this great tradition and, particularly, among African Americans.

A good many of the first Black cowboys were born into slavery but later found a better life on the open range.

I know many of us have heard of the Buffalo Soldiers. The Indians called African American soldiers that because of the woolliness of their hair. They were on horses, and they were fighting as well for the viewpoint of that time.

Some Black cowboys took up careers as rodeo performers, or were hired as Federal peace officers in Indian territory.

Our history weaves in and out, and it is a colorful history, and it mentions a number of people. I will mention Daniel W. ''80 John'' Wallace, who started riding the cattle trails in his adolescence and ultimately worked for cattlemen Winfield Scott and Gus O'Keefe. He put his accumulated savings toward the purchase of a ranch near Loraine, where he acquired more than 1,200 acres—that is a big deal—and 500 to 600 cattle.

We have been ranching for a long time, and Texas has a great tradition.

I want to talk about my friend, Mollie Stevenson, a fourth-generation owner of the Taylor-Stevenson ranch. I would take my children out there. She would have little horses and ponies for them to run and ride. She founded the American Cowboy Museum to honor Black, Indian, and Mexican American cowboys, to be able to embrace everyone.

Weekend rodeos featuring Black cowboys began in the late 1940s and continued to be popular. The contests of the Negro Cowboys Rodeo Association is evident that we have a strong history.

So I think it is important tonight that we salute the long history that we have had in many different areas and be able to say, as I close, again, that there is work yet to be done in the pouring forward of our history, whether it is to reflect on the cowboys who, at times, were poorly fed, underpaid, overworked, deprived of sleep, prone to boredom and loneliness, but they kept on going; or it is to fix the criminal justice system of the 21st century, to be able to recognize that for all the cowboys and the historic persons whose names I have called, Dr. King and his wife, who stood alongside him, Coretta Scott King, that we fix together the criminal justice system, and that we work to find ways to work with law enforcement; but we answer the questions of those grieving mothers, Trayvon Martin's mother, Eric Garner's mother, Sean Bell, Michael Brown, Tamir, and all of them, and we find ways to ensure the wives and family members of law enforcement, that, yes, your husband or wife, as a law enforcement officer, will come home.

Over the years, I have worked with the Federal law enforcement as a member of the House Judiciary Committee. We have always found ways to make their life easier in terms of the quality of life and work and expanded cops on the beat programs, and so now we can come together on training and the grand jury system and prison reform, which are not prone to any one group in America. It is an American issue.

I truly believe that the history of all people, the history of Americans, no matter what their background, is one of clinging to democracy and the principles of the Bill of Rights, that we all have a decent opportunity to be respected by our law enforcement processes. Whether it is our courts or whether it is our process of trying cases, we all are to be respected.

With that, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I end on the very note that this is a great country, and the history of African Americans has contributed to its greatness. Let us use the richness of their history to cast forward a new lot that will change America for the best as we move forward for justice, equality and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this February we recognize and celebrate the 39th commemoration of Black History Month.

This month we celebrate the contributions of African Americans to the history of our great nation, and pay tribute to trailblazers, pioneers, heroes, and leaders like Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, U.S. Senator Blanche Kelso Bruce, U.S. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, U.S. Congressman Mickey Leland, Astronauts Dr. Guion Stewart Bluford Jr. and Mae C. Jemison, Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington, James Baldwin, Harriet Tubman, Rosa Parks, Maya Angelou, Toni Morrison, and Gwendolyn Brooks just to name a few of the countless number of well-known and unsung heroes whose contributions have helped our nation become a more perfect union.

The history of the United States has been marked by the great contributions of African American activists, leaders, writers, and artists.

As a member of Congress, I know that I stand on the shoulders of giants whose struggles and triumphs made it possible for me to stand here today and continue the fight for equality, justice, and progress for all, regardless of race, religion, gender or sexual orientation.

The greatest of these giants to me are Mrs. Ivalita ''Ivy'' Jackson, a vocational nurse, and Mr. Ezra A. Jackson, one of the first African-Americans to succeed in the comic book publishing business.

They were my beloved parents and they taught me the value of education, hard work, discipline, perseverance, and caring for others.

And I am continually inspired by Dr. Elwyn Lee, my husband and the first tenured African American law professor at the University of Houston.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly wish to acknowledge the contributions of African American veterans in defending from foreign aggressors and who by their courageous examples helped transform our nation from a segregated society to a nation committed to the never ending challenge of perfecting our union.

Last year about this time, I was honored to join my colleagues, Congressman JOHN LEWIS and Congressman CHARLES RANGEL, a Korean War veteran, in paying tribute to surviving members of the Tuskegee Airmen and the 555th Parachute Infantry, the famed ''Triple Nickels'' at a moving ceremony sponsored by the U.S. Army commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The success of the Tuskegee Airmen in escorting bombers during World War II achieving one of the lowest loss records of all the escort fighter groups, and being in constant demand for their services by the allied bomber units—is a record unmatched by any other fighter group.

So impressive and astounding were the feats of the Tuskegee Airmen that in 1948, it helped persuade President Harry Truman to issue his famous Executive Order No. 9981, which directed equality of treatment and opportunity in all of the United States Armed Forces and led to the end of racial segregation in the U.S. military forces.

It is a source of enormous and enduring pride that my father-in-law, Phillip Ferguson Lee, was one of the Tuskegee Airmen.

Clearly, what began as an experiment to determine whether ''colored'' soldiers' were capable of operating expensive and complex combat aircraft ended as an unqualified success based on the experience of the Tuskegee Airmen, whose record included 261 aircraft destroyed, 148 aircraft damaged, 15,553 combat sorties and 1,578 missions over Italy and North Africa.

They also destroyed or damaged over 950 units of ground transportation and escorted more than 200 bombing missions. They proved that ''the antidote to racism is excellence in performance,'' as retired Lt. Col. Herbert Carter once remarked.

Mr. Speaker, Black History Month is also a time to remember many pioneering women like U.S. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm; activists Harriet Tubman and Rosa Parks; astronaut Mae C. Jemison; authors Maya Angelou, Toni Morrison, and Gwendolyn Brooks; all of whom have each in their own way, whether through courageous activism, cultural contributions, or artistic creativity, forged social and political change, and forever changed our great Nation for the better.

It is also fitting, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to those national leaders who contributions have made our nation better, we honor also those who have and are making a difference in their local communities.

In my home city of Houston, there are numerous great men and women. They are great because they have heeded the counsel of Dr. King who said: ''Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. You only a need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.''

By that measure, I wish to pay tribute to some of the great men and women of Houston:

1. Rev. F.N. Williams, Sr.
2. Rev. Dr. S.J. Gilbert, Sr.
3. Rev. Crawford W. Kimble
4. Rev. Eldridge Stanley Branch
5. Rev. William A. Lawson
6. Rev. Johnnie Jeffery ''J.J.'' Robeson
7. Mr. El Franco Lee
8. Mr. John Bland
9. Ms. Ruby Moseley
10. Ms. Dorothy Hubbard
11. Ms. Doris Hubbard
12. Ms. Willie Bell Boone
13. Ms. Holly HogoBrooks
14. Mr. Deloyd Parker
15. Ms. Lenora ''Doll'' Carter

As we celebrate Black History Month, let us pay tribute to those who have come before us, and pay forward to future generations by addressing what is the number one issue for African American families, and all American families today: preserving the American promise of economic opportunity for all.

Our immediate focus must be job creation, and enacting legislation that will foster and lay the foundation for today's and tomorrow's generation of groundbreaking activists, leaders, scientists, writers and artists to continue contributing to the greatness of America.

We must work to get Americans back to work. We must continue to preserve the American Dream for all.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here in celebration of the heroic and historic acts of African Americans and their indispensable contributions to this great Nation.

It is through our work in creating possibilities for today and future generations that we best honor the accomplishments and legacy of our predecessors.

PRAIRIE VIEW TRAIL RIDE ASSOCIATION

The Prairie View Trail Ride Association makes an annual trek to the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo in Hempstead.

They then rendezvous with a dozen other caravans at Memorial Park where they will join the rodeo parade in downtown Houston.

The Prairie View Trail Ride Association was founded in 1957 by James Francies Jr., Dr. Alfred N. Poindexter and Myrtis Dightman Sr.

This group's mission statement says: ''The purpose of the Prairie View Trail is to promote agricultural interest in young Americans and to perpetuate those principals and methods which have come to be regarded as the ideals and traditions of the Western World as well as the Negro Western Heritage.

PVTR serves as a booster for the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo and supports Prairie View A&M University in their educational programs.''

BLACK COWBOYS OF TEXAS

Black cowboys have been part of Texas history since the early nineteenth century, when they first worked on ranches throughout the state.

A good many of the first black cowboys were born into slavery but later found a better life on the open range, where they experienced less open discrimination than in the city.

After the Civil War many were employed as horsebreakers and for other tasks, but few of them became ranch foremen or managers.

Some black cowboys took up careers as rodeo performers or were hired as federal peace officers in Indian Territory.

Others ultimately owned their own farms and ranches, while a few who followed the lure of the Wild West became gunfighters and outlaws.

Significant numbers of African Americans went on the great cattle drives originating in the Southwest in the late 1800s. Black cowboys predominated in ranching sections of the Coastal Plain between the Sabine and Guadalupe rivers.

A number of them achieved enviable reputations. Bose Ikard, a top hand and drover for rancher Charles Goodnight, also served him as his chief detective and banker.

Daniel W. (80 John) Wallace started riding the cattle trails in his adolescence and ultimately worked for cattlemen Winfield Scott and Gus O'Keefe. He put his accumulated savings toward the purchase of a ranch near Loraine, where he acquired more than 1,200 acres and 500 to 600 cattle.

He was a member of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association for more than thirty years. William Pickett made his name as one of the most outstanding Wild West rodeo performers in the country and is credited with originating the modern event known as bulldogging. He was inducted into the National Cowboy Hall of Fame in 1971.

Black cowboys have continued to work in the ranching industry throughout the twentieth century, and African Americans who inherited family-owned ranches have attempted to bring public recognition to the contributions of their ancestors.

Mollie Stevenson, a fourth-generation owner of the Taylor-Stevenson Ranch near Houston, founded the American Cowboy Museum to honor black, Indian, and Mexican-American cowboys. Weekend rodeos featuring black cowboys began in the late 19405 and continue to be popular.

These contests owe their existence to the Negro Cowboys Rodeo Association, formed in 1947 by a group of East Texas black businessmen-ranchers and cowboys.

In the early days of Texas, the work of the cowhand was essential to the newly arrived settlers building a life on the frontier.

The story of the Anglo cowboys who worked the ranches of Texas is well known, but much more remains to be discovered about the African American cowhands who worked side-by-side with the vaqueros and Anglo cowboys.

The cowboy learned his craft from the vaqueros of New Spain an Texas when it was the northern territory of Mexico, as well as from the stock raisers of the South.

Such a life was hardly glamorous. Poorly fed, underpaid, overworked, deprived of by snakes or tripped by prairie dog holes.

Work centered on the fall and spring roundups, when scattered cattle were sleep, and prone to boredom and loneliness, cowboys choked in the dust, were cold at night, and suffered broken bones in falls and spills from horses spooked collected and driven to a place for branding, sorting for market, castrating, and in later years, dipping in vats to prevent tick fever.

African American cowboys, however, also had to survive discrimination, bigotry, and prejudice.

The lives of these cowhands tell a story of skill and grit, as they did what was necessary to gain the trust and respect of those who controlled their destiny.

That meant being the best at roping, bronc busting, taming mustangs, calling the brands, controlling the remuda, or topping off horses.

From scattered courthouse records, writings, and interviews with a few of the African American cowhands who were part of the history of Texas, Sara R. Massey and a host of writers have retrieved the stories of a more diverse cattle industry than has been previously recorded.

Twenty-five writers here recount tales of African Americans such as Peter Martin, who hauled freight and assisted insurgents in a rebellion against the Mexican government while building a herd of cattle that allowed him to own (through a proxy) rental houses in town.

Bose Ikard, a friend of Charles Goodnight, went on Goodnight's first cattle drive, opening the Goodnight-Loving Trail. Johanna July, a Black Seminole woman, had her own method of taming horses in the Rio Grande for the soldiers at Fort Duncan.

These cowhands, along with others across the state, had an important role that has been too long omitted from most history books.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 5, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

313. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's Buy American Act Report for fiscal year 2014, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 10a(b), as amended; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

314. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Agency's reports containing the September 30, 2014, status of loans and guarantees issued under Section 25(a)(11) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

315. A letter from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report entitled ''Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine'', pursuant to the Export Administration Act, section 6(f)(2), under the authority conferred by Executive Order 13222, as amended and extended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

316. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties, entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

317. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

318. A letter from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting notification that the Administration complied with the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

319. A letter from the Congressional Relations, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the Service's annual report for Fiscal Year 2014, prepared in accordance with Title II, Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

320. A letter from the Secretary of the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the Service's 2014 report to Congress, as required by Section 3686(c) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

321. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2013 Report to Congress on the Funding Requirements for Contract Support Costs, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 450j-1(c); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

322. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Management Systems for Domestic, Flag, and Supplemental Operations Certificate Holders [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0671; Amendment Nos.: 5-1 and 119-17] (RIN: 2120-AJ86) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

323. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30993; Amdt. No.: 3622] received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

324. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30996; Amdt. No.: 3624] received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

325. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30995; Amdt. No.: 3623] received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

326. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0692; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-18031; AD 2014-23-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

327. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0587; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-219-AD; Amendment 39-18059; AD 2014-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

328. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0580; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-081-AD; Amendment 39-18062; AD 2015-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

329. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0108; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-052-AD; Amendment 39-18063; AD 2015-01-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

330. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0927; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-230-AD; Amendment 39-18068; AD 2014-26-53] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

331. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0924; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-228-AD; Amendment 39-18067; AD 2014-25-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

332. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting notification about a Commission survey regarding cyber threats to U.S. critical infrastructure; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. YODER (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUM, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DENT, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. EMMER, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATTA, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr.

RIBBLE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. BARTON):

H.R. 700. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment of individuals under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand access to Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 702. A bill to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HANNA, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 703. A bill to repeal the renewable fuel program of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DENT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 704. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate certain requirements under the renewable fuel program, to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from approving the introduction into commerce of gasoline that contains greater than 10-volume-percent ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 705. A bill to amend the authorization in title 49, United States Code, for capital grants for rail line relocation projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 706. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DENT, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 707. A bill to restore long-standing United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 708. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce, the sale or use of certain software to circumvent control measures used by Internet ticket sellers to ensure equitable consumer access to tickets for any given event, and to provide for criminal penalties for such acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KLINE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LONG, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. REED, and Mrs. ROBY):

H.R. 709. A bill to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 710. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 711. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the windfall elimination provision and protect the retirement of public servants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. TROTT):

H.R. 712. A bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 713. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the refundable portion of the child credit to taxpayers using individual taxpayer identification numbers issued by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 714. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 715. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to give members of the United States Capitol Police the option to delay mandatory retirement until age 60; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 716. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 717. A bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 718. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to support the community schools model; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SANFORD):

H.R. 719. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 720. A bill to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROKITA, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 722. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 723. A bill to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of fire fighters, law enforcement officers, members of rescue squads or ambulance crews, and public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 724. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to impose restrictions on the risk corridor program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MESSER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LONG, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate tax and retain stepped-up basis at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 726. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from mandating the deployment of vulnerabilities in data security technologies; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 727. A bill to set forth the process for Puerto Rico to be admitted as a State of the Union; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 728. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the ''Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 729. A bill to provide for a Medicare demonstration project to evaluate the fiscal impact of covering low vision devices as durable medical equipment under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 730. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate Congressional review of newly-passed District laws; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 731. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 732. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the opportunity for veterans to use video conferencing for hearings before the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LONG, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 733. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require households that receive supplemental nutrition assistance benefits to present photographic verification at the time food is purchased with such benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 735. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 736. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to be used to recruit, hire, and train 100,000 new classroom paraprofessionals in order to improve educational achievement for children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 737. A bill to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the egg, meat, and poultry inspection laws to ensure that consumers receive notification regarding food products produced from crops, livestock, or poultry raised on land on which sewage sludge was applied; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 738. A bill to waive certain prohibitions with respect to nationals of Cuba coming to the United States to play organized professional baseball; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 739. A bill to permit members of the House of Representatives to donate used computer equipment to public elementary and secondary schools designated by the members; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a business credit relating to the use of clean-fuel and fuel efficient vehicles by businesses within areas designated as nonattainment areas under the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate income tax overpayments as contributions to the United States Library Trust

Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 742. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 743. A bill to improve rangeland conditions and restore grazing levels within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Utah; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 744. A bill to authorize the collection of supplemental payments to increase congressional investments in medical research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 745. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that John Arthur ''Jack'' Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon for the racially motivated conviction in 1913 that diminished the athletic, cultural, and historic significance of Jack Johnson and unduly tarnished his reputation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 86. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 4, 2015, as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H. Res. 87. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 88. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. Res. 89. A resolution supporting ''United States Foreign Service Day'' in recognition of the men and women who have served, or are presently serving, in the Foreign Service of the United States, and to honor those in the Foreign Service who have given their lives in the line of duty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. Res. 90. A resolution recognizing the importance of the United States International Boundary Water Commission (USIBWC) and its recent efforts to address trash, sediment, and water quality issues with their Mexican counterparts, Comisión Internacional de Límites y Aguas (CILA), through a proposed minute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Clause 1: The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign Nations . . .''

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3. Because the federal government has extended Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the commerce clause) beyond its intended boundaries, it follows that efforts to rein in excessive federal government encroachment in this area can be justified by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3. Because the federal government has extended Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the commerce clause) beyond its intended boundaries, it follows that efforts to rein in excessive federal government encroachment in this area can be justified by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Aritcle I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 states that Congress has the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Congress, which grants Congress, ''the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises . . .''

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3, and 18, and Article III of the United States Constitution, Section 2

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 3, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States;'' Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec.5, Clause 2: ''Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings . . .''

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Taxation: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to admit new States into the Union and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories of the United States, as enumerated in Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7, ''The Congress shall have Power to . . . establish Post Offices and post Roads . . .'' In the Constitution, the power possessed by Congress embraces the regulation of the Postal System in the country. Therefore, the proposed legislation in naming a post office would fall under the powers granted to Congress in the Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: to provide for the common defense and general welfare.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.''

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes,'' Article I Section 8, Clause 1, which give Congress the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposets and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States,'' and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.''

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which gives Congress the power ''To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.''

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 5 of article I of the Constitution, which states: ''Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.''

Additionally, Congress has the power to enact this legislation under Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution, which states that ''The Congress shall have

Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which states that ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises. . .''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 allows Congress ''[to] make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'' Article IV, Section 3

''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.'' Article X

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

Clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which provies that ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 27: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 106: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 131: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 156: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 173: Mr. POSEY and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 201: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 223: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 234: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 235: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. MENG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 247: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 263: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 277: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 283: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 304: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 340: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 352: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 379: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 402: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 429: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 430: Mr. RICHMOND, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 448: Mrs. CAPPS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 451: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 455: MISS RICE of New York.

H.R. 465: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 483: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 509: Mr. RUSH and MISS RICE of New York.

H.R. 525: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 529: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 531: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 537: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 541: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 544: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 546: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 551: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 565: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 586: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 592: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. OLSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 594: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 595: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 598: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 599: Mr. KLINE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FORBES, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 608: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 614: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 622: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 631: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 641: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 644: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 654: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 662: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 664: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 676: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 680: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 684: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 696: Mr. KIND.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HARDY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. SANFORD.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Res. 12: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 24: Mrs. BUSTOS and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 26: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H. Res. 32: Ms. PLASKETT.

H. Res. 45: Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 50: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 54: Mr. RUSH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 56: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 67: Ms. SPEIER.

H. Res. 74: Ms. BORDALLO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative SCOTT PETERS (CA) or a designee to H.R. 527 the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 279: Mr. RANGEL.